

APR 1 - 1960

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

modern language notes

THE JOHN'S HOPKINS PRESS

VOL. LXXV, NO. 2, FEBRUARY 1960

P

-
- 97 Horse or Horses: A Chaucerian Textual Problem.
GARLAND ETHEL
- 101 The Philosophre of Chaucer's Parson. ROBERT C. FOX
- 103 The Fatal Bark. MICHAEL LLOYD
- 108 Milton's Eve and the Evening Angels. D. C. ALLEN
- 109 The Twin Motif in "The Fall of the House of Usher."
WILLIAM BYSSHE STEIN
- 111 A Gloss on *The Red Badge of Courage*. ERIC SOLOMON
- 114 Henry James's Use of the Word *Wonderful* in *The Ambassadors*.
MARY KYLE MICHAEL
- 118 George Peele and *A Farewell to Arms*: A Thematic Tie?
JEROME L. MAZZARO
- 119 Yeats's Arthurian Black Tower. W. J. KEITH
- 123 A Page in *Finnegans Wake* Explained. MARCEL P. HORNIK
- 126 Ronsard's *Préface sur la musique*. NAN COOKE CARPENTER
- 133 From Hack to Editor—Diderot and the Booksellers.
JAMES DOOLITTLE
- 139 Nodier: *Le Vieux Marinier*. ALBERT J. GEORGE
- 143 L'Invention poétique et l'automatisme mental. CLAUDE VICÉE

REVIEWS

- 154 CYNEWULF, Elene, ed. P. O. E. GRANDON (L. A. MUINZER)
- 158 RICHMOND P. BOND, ed., *New Letters to the Tatler and Spectator* (RAE BLANCHARD)
- 160 THOMAS W. COPELAND, ed., *The Correspondence of Edmund Burke*. Vol. I, April 1744-June 1768 (DAVID SPRING)
- 163 BERNARDIN DE SAINT-PIERRE, *Paul et Virginie*, ed. PIERRE TRAHARD (LESTER G. CROCKER)
- 165 GUSTAVE DE BEAUMONT, *Marie or Slavery in the United States, A Novel of Jacksonian America*, trans. BARBARA CHAPMAN, introd. ALVIS L. TINNIN (LIONEL GOSSMAN)
- 166 JEAN POMMIER, *L'Invention et l'écriture dans La Torpille d'Honoré de Balzac* (JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ)
- 169 HONORÉ DE BALZAC, *Splendeurs et misères des courtisanes*, ed., ANTOINE ADAM (MAURICE LECUYER)
- 171 ROGER SHATTUCK, *The Banquet Years* (GERMAINE BRÉE)
- 174 MARCEL PROUST, *On Art and Literature 1896-1919*, trans. SYLVIA TOWNSEND WARNER (WALTER A. STRAUSS)
- 177 MICHAEL F. MOLONEY, *François Mauriac: A Critical Study* (THOMAS CORDLE)
- 180 LEWIS W. SPITZ, *Conrad Celtis: The German Arch-Humanist* (ELI SOBEL)
- 182 PETER F. GANZ, *Der Einfluss des Englischen auf den deutschen Wortschatz 1640-1815* (RICHARD PACKHAM)
- 184 CLAUS VICTOR BOCK, *Quirinus Kuhlmann als Dichter* (BLAKE LEE SPAHR)
- 187 CHRISTEL MATTHIAS SCHRÖDER, *Die "Bremer Beiträge." Vorgeschichte und Geschichte einer deutschen Zeitschrift des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (EDGAR LOHNER)
- 190 GOTTFRIED F. MERKEL, ed., *On Romanticism and the Art of Translation. Studies in Honor of Edwin Hermann Zeydel* (BERNHARD ULMER)

modern language notes

NATHAN EDELMAN,
General Editor

WOLFGANG E. THORMANN,
Managing Assistant

DON CAMERON ALLEN
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
STEFAN EINARSSON
JOHN FRECCERO
RENÉ N. GIRARD
J. LIONEL GOSSMAN
RICHARD H. GREEN
THOMAS R. HART, JR.
ANNA G. HATCHER
HAROLD JANTZ
WILLIAM H. McCLAIN
J. HILLIS MILLER
LAWRENCE J. ROSS
CHARLES S. SINGLETON
BRUCE W. WARDROPPER
EARL R. WASSERMAN

Published eight times annually, November through June. Subscription: \$8.00 in the United States; \$8.25 in Canada; \$8.50 in other countries. Single issue, \$1.25. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Md. Claims for replacement of missing numbers must be received within 3 months (6 months in the case of foreign subscribers) following publication of the number.

Contributors and publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to *Modern Language Notes*, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 18, Md. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped return envelope. In preparing manuscripts, contributors are requested to follow the MLA Style Sheet.

Entered as Second-class Matter at the Baltimore, Md. Postoffice. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Congress of July 16 1894.

b)
April

CKER)
onian

ER

0-1815

nichte
ies in

through
es; \$8.2
ne, \$1.25
s should
18, Md
must be
e of for
number

manuscript
otes, The
1. Every
ed return
utors are

ore, Md.
rate of
Congres

pril
(22)
nian

815

hte
s in

rough
\$8.25
\$1.25
ould
Md
at be
f for
mber

criptu
The
Every
turn
are

Md.
te of
gren

modern language notes

VOL. LXXV, NO. 2, FEBRUARY 1960

Horse or Horses: A Chaucerian Textual Problem

But, for to tellen yow of his array,
His hors were goode, but he was nat gay.

—*Canterbury Tales*, General Prologue 73-74

In glossing this passage, Skeat, by taking *hors* in the plural, set the interpretative pattern that makes the Knight the one who was not gaily decked. Skeat's gloss begins, "'His horses were good, but he himself was not gaudily dressed. *Hors* is plural as well as singular'."¹ If we thus accept *hors* as plural and therefore "but he was nat gay" as said of the Knight, Chaucer's ideal chivalric character gains nothing but rather is deprived of an outstanding excellence. This is of considerable importance for, as Malone has stressed, the poet relied not upon mere assertion of the Knight's moral supremacy but upon attributing to him a number of specific qualities that add up to what a knight, a claimant to gentillesse, ought to be.²

That the Knight himself was unostentatiously clothed becomes quite clear from the fact that he rode in a "gypon al bismotered with his habergeon." To say additionally that he was not gaudily dressed contributes but little to the characterization. If, on the other hand,

¹ Walter W. Skeat, *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1900), v, 8.

² Kemp Malone, *Chapters On Chaucer* (Baltimore, 1951), pp. 198-199.

hors is singular, then the horse as grammatical antecedent of *he* is understood as the one that is not gay. The Knight's moral stature is thereby markedly enhanced because it sets him apart as not displaying that rich and showy equipage against which Church moralists so impotently inveighed.

Skeat's interpretation is based chiefly upon the ground that in ME (as in OE) *hors* is the form for both singular and plural nominative. This one form for both does produce uncertainty and apparently is what caused Skeat to propose his bolstering textual amendment. Other inflections, particularly of "his" and "goode" might throw light on the subject, but careful review of ME possessive pronoun and adjective paradigms gave nothing decisive.³ True enough, certain inflectional forms preponderate, but there is lack of uniformity between manuscripts and even within the same MS. As an example, El. 203 reads "His bootes souple / his hors in greet estaat."⁴ The Monk's boots are clearly plural and horse is singular, but instead of the plural *hise* or *hese* we find the singular "*his* bootes." A few of many other instances from the *Six-Text Print* are to be seen in Gen. Prol. 273-274, 287, and in *KnT* 1633 and 2686.

The most promising lead for determining whether *hors* should be understood as singular or plural lies with the verb *were*. If *were* is not only grammatically but syntactically plural, *hors* must necessarily be plural. The Lansdowne MS., however, reads "His hors *was* gode but he was noughte gaye," a construction in which *hors* is immediately understood as the subject of both predications and therefore as the antecedent of *he*. The other *Six-Text* MMS have not "was" but "were," the reading accepted by Skeat, Manly, Robinson, and Manly-Rickert. "Were," one suspects, is what was really decisive in their holding *hors* to be plural; consequently comments on the number of horses, such as those ventured by Skeat and Malone, and Manly's disturbed query whether the Yeoman was leading the Knight's

³ Henry Sweet, *A New English Grammar* (Oxford, 1891, Impr. 1955), I, §§ 1093-1094; Max Kaluza, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, Zweite Auflage (Berlin, 1906-1907), II, § 321; John M. Manly, "Observations On The Language of Chaucer's Legend of Good Women," *Studies and Notes in Philology and Literature* (Boston, 1893), II, § 74; George Lyman Kittredge, *Observations on the Language of Chaucer's Troilus*, Chaucer Society (London, 1891, Repr. 1898), § 74, II. For adjectives: Sweet, op. cit., I, § 1030; Kaluza, op. cit., II, § 311; Bernhard Ten Brink, *The Language And Metre Of Chaucer*, 2nd ed., rev. by F. Kluge, tr. M. Bentineck Smith (London, 1901), § 232.

⁴ F. J. Furnivall, *A Six-Text Print of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*. Chaucer Society (London, n. d.), First Series, Part I.

war horse, are most likely the result of rationalizing the verb.⁵ On the other hand, several editors and modernizers from as early as the 18th century have adopted a text that agrees with the Lansdowne MS. Of these, Thomas Wright and Henry Sweet are particularly noteworthy. Wright's text, following Harleian 7334, reads "was good," but Sweet departed from his, the Ellesmere, to print "was."⁶ In the present discussion, however, *were* is assumed to be what Chaucer wrote. The grammatical problem therefore boils down to whether *were* can be reconciled with *hors* as the singular subject. It can be reconciled, and easily, by regarding *were* as not the indicative but as the subjunctive 3rd person singular preterit.⁷

To do this, "His hors were goode, but he was nat gay," must be recognized as a conditional sentence consisting of an hypothetical and a completing principal clause. The first clause is concessive, one variety of the hypothetical that in ME as in Mod. E takes the subjunctive. The conjunction *but*, which introduces the principal clause, completes the meaning in a sense sharply adversative to the concessive first clause as is standard for this construction.⁸

Here some may object that the *though* or *although* which ordinarily introduces the concessive conditional is lacking in line 74. Such ellipsis, however, is not foreign to ME generally nor to Chaucer. As Kellner has remarked, many scholars bristle at the suggestion that any construction is elliptical;⁹ but the very sort under consideration was recognized by Sweet,¹⁰ and later was extensively treated by Ohlander who cites many instances where one of the adversative elements is omitted, as in the case of line 74.¹¹ Ohlander argues that the adversative idea conveyed by "but" is so strong that a preceding

⁵ Kemp Malone, op. cit., p. 198; John Matthews Manly, *Canterbury Tales* (New York, 1928), p. 501 n.

⁶ Thomas Wright, "Introduction," *The Canterbury Tales of Geoffrey Chaucer*, Percy Society (London, 1847), I, xxxv, 4; Henry Sweet, "Preface," *Second Middle English Primer*, 2nd ed., rev., (Oxford, 1927), pp. vi, 76; John M. Manly & Edith Rickert, *The Text of The Canterbury Tales* (Chicago, 1940), v, Part I, 7.

⁷ Kaluza, op. cit., II, § 342; Samuel Moore, *Historical Outlines of English Phonology and Middle English Grammar* (Ann Arbor, 1919), p. 69; Sweet, *NEG*, I, § 1490; Francis J. Child, "Observations on the Language of Chaucer," *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, New Ser., VIII, Part II (Cambridge and Boston, 1863), § 56; Kittredge, op. cit., § 113.

⁸ Sweet, *NEG*, I, § 417; Urban Ohlander, "Studies On Coordinate Expressions In Middle English," *Lund Studies In English* (Lund, 1936), v, 11.

⁹ Leon Kellner, *Historical Outlines of English Syntax* (London and New York, 1892), § 26.

¹⁰ Sweet, *NEG*, I, § 418.

¹¹ Ohlander, op. cit., 16-28, esp. 17-18.

conditional is understood whether fully expressed or not.¹² In Chaucer's day when the subjunctive was so commonly used, such omission would not have been disturbing.

Another and illuminating use of this construction appears earlier in the portrait of the Knight: "And though that he were worthy, he was wys." Both passages employ the subjunctive *were* but differ as to which conjunction is elliptically suppressed. In each case suppression is determined by what is to be emphasized, for the retained conjunction is what confers pre-eminence upon the clause it introduces.¹³ In line 68 the summation idea of soldierly merit, the thing to be stressed, is introduced by *though*, and this stress is intensified by omitting the adversative *yet* or *still* from the completing clause. Line 74, on the other hand, omits the concessive *though* and retains the adversative *but*, thus throwing the emphasis upon the second or principal clause. Had Chaucer written "And *though* his hors were goode, he was nat gay," the overbalance of attention would be directed to the fact that the horse was good, a ludicrous emphasis because every knight, whether on a war horse or a palfrey, was expected to be well mounted.¹⁴ The element of exception or surprise implicit in the adversative rests not in the fact that the horse was good but rather that he was not outrageously arrayed in embroidered skirts, ostrich plumes, golden tassels and chiming bells—a display so common that knights' horses were consistently depicted in this way by contemporary artists.¹⁵ This ostentatious caparisoning which Chaucer's Parson lists under "apparaille apertenen to ridynge" consists, he says, of such items as "sadeles . . . crouperes, peytrels, and bridles covered with precious clothynge, and riche barres and plates of gold and of silver." And for the riders of such horses he cites Scriptural promise of a divine confounding. These outward signs of pride are precisely the ones condemned and forbidden in the *Statutes of the Knights Tem-*

¹² Ibid., 17, also 11-12, 14, 16.

¹³ Kellner, op. cit., §§ 27-28.

¹⁴ William Caxton, *The Book of the Ordre of Chyvalry*, ed. Alfred T. P. Byles, EETS, O. S. 168 (Oxford, 1926), 84; Léon Gautier, n., "'C' Le Cheval et son harnais," *La Chevalerie*, nouvelle édition (Paris, n.d.), pp. 722 ff.; Du Cange, *Glossarium . . . mediae et infimae Latinitatis* (Niort, 1883-1887), see "Dextrarii" and "Equus."

¹⁵ André Lejard, *Le Cheval dans l'art* (Paris, 1948), plates 36, 40, 51, 52, 53, 74; Eric G. Millar, *English Illuminated Manuscripts of the XIVth and XVth Centuries* (Paris and Brussels, 1928), plate 58 and expl. note p. 61; Alwin Schultz, *Das höfische Leben*, Zweite Auflage (Leipzig, 1889), II, figs. 91, 93, 94, 100; René D'Anjou, "Traité de la forme et devis d'un tournoi," *Verve*, IV, No. 16 (Paris, 1946), plates between pp. 16-57.

plar, a prohibition but ill observed despite the special emphasis on religion that characterized the Order.¹⁶

The chivalric ideal, in conception and formulation, owed much to the Church which saw in it a means of abating the violence and of humanizing the feudal barons.¹⁷ Because the Church held pride the worst of sins, and humility, its opposite, first among virtues, Chaucer's Knight as ideal, must necessarily be free of the one and possess the other. Simplicity in the horse's caparisoning matches the Knight's own dress. Furthermore, his choice to ride attended but by his son and the Yeoman would not be lost upon Chaucer's audience daily familiar with retinues such as the Earl of Derby's 7 knights, 10 squires, 2 heralds, and 25-30 valets and servants.¹⁸ Derby, of course, was one of the great lords, but generally the lesser sought to imitate them. Finally, the contrast with the Monk is not to be overlooked. His horse in "greet estaat" reflects that manifold of worldly corruption from which Chaucer, point by point, portrayed his Knight as free. And this objective gains tellingly by understanding that it was the horse that was not gay.

University of Washington

GARLAND ETHEL

The Philosophre of Chaucer's Parson

Chaucer's Parson, in his preliminary remarks about the Deadly Sin of Ire, states that "Ire, after the philosophre, is the fervent blood of man yquyked in his herte, thurgh which he wole harm to hym that he hateth."¹ F. N. Robinson's note to this line, made in his

¹⁶ F. N. Robinson, *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1957), p. 240, Pars T 432-436. Unless otherwise noted all Chaucer quotations are from Robinson's edition. Charles Mills, *The History of Chivalry or Knighthood and its times* (London, 1826), I, 116-117; Gautier, op. cit., n. II, "Le Harnachement du cheval," pp. 729 ff.; Friedrich Pfeiffer, "Sattel, Geschirr und Schmuck," *Das Ross im Altdeutschen* (Breslau, 1855), pp. 16-24.

¹⁷ Gautier, op. cit., Chs. I-II, esp. the "dix commandements le code antique de la chevalerie," p. 33; John of Salisbury, *The Statesman's Book Of Salisbury / Policraticus*, tr. by John Dickinson (New York, 1927), pp. 198-204; C. W. Previté-Orton, *The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History* (Cambridge, 1952), I, 422-423, II, 937; Sir Edward Strachey, "An Essay On Chivalry," *Le Morte Darthur* (London, 1909), pp. xxxix-xl.

¹⁸ Albert S. Cook, "The Historical Background of Chaucer's Knight," *Trans. of the Conn. Acad. of Arts and Sciences*, 20 (Feb., 1916), 172 n.

¹ *The Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson, Second edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1957), line 538. Line references to Chaucer are to this edition.

first edition of Chaucer's works (1933), has been reprinted without change twenty-four years later in the second: "The *philosophe* not identified. Skeat quotes Horace, Ep. i, 2, 62: 'Ira furor brevis est.' But neither this nor the passage from Peraldus cited by Miss Petersen (p. 49) is quite parallel to Chaucer."²

The most likely possibility is that Chaucer had in mind Seneca, who in his *De Ira* stated that:

... certain ones of our school maintain that anger is aroused in the breast by the boiling of the blood around the region of the heart. The reason why this is the most likely place assigned to anger is none other than the fact that in the entire body the warmest spot is the breast.

(*De Ira*, II. 19.3)

By "our school" Seneca meant the Stoics. The passage which I have quoted occurs in the course of a discussion concerning the Stoic concept of the interrelationship of man and nature. Just as there are the four elements of earth, air, fire and water, so there are the corresponding properties of hot, cold, dry and moist. The differences throughout animate and inanimate nature are caused by the mingling of these elements. A man's character is determined by whatever has predominance: the predominance of heat or fire produces angry men, since fire is active and stubborn. In a similar manner, the predominance of cold produces cowards. Hence the contention that anger is produced by the boiling of blood about the heart (*De Ira*, II. 19.1-5).

It should cause no surprise to learn that Chaucer drew upon Seneca for this concept, for there are sixteen other references to Seneca in his works. Two of these are from the *De Ira*—in the *Summoner's Tale* (2018) and in the *Tale of Melibee* (*2671, 1481). Elsewhere in the *Parson's Tale* Seneca is quoted and referred to by name twice (467, 759).

St. Francis College, Brooklyn

ROBERT C. FOX

² Robinson (ed.), *Works*, note on p. 769.

The Fatal Bark

It was that fatal and perfidious Bark
Built in th' eclipse, and rigg'd with curses dark,
That sunk so low that sacred head of thine. (*Lycidas*, 100-2)

These words are not merely a piece of atmospheric evocation. They carry a full weight of Miltonic meaning. The Herald of the Sea has asked what has doomed Lycidas; and the answer to this crucial question does not lie in the ship in which Lycidas sailed. Nor is it enough to see here "a dark reference" attributing the death to "something outside nature, something supernatural" (*Poems* of 1645, ed. Brooks and Hardy, 1951, p. 178). The tone is dark; the meaning is not, and it is on the contrary not "something outside nature." It refers to the mortal bark, built in the eclipse man has endured since Adam's fall. The curses with which it is rigged are those which Adam brought on man, among them subjection to death. The body's bark is fatal (subject to the action of the Fates, seen as instruments of death in *Arcades*, 65-7), because it is perfidious (inheriting Adam's faithlessness to God, though it may learn "the faithfull Herdmans art").

All these words must bear their full Miltonic interpretation, for they are to be used with perfect consistency in just this pattern in a later poem. The eclipse marks the entry of Sin and Death into the world, and the expulsion from Eden, in *Paradise Lost* (x, 413, xi, 183). Curses are visited upon man at the Fall (*P. L.*, x, 201, 723-9), and especially that of death (*P. L.*, x, 640, 815-22). "All nature is likewise subject to mortality and a curse on account of man. . . . The death of the body is to be considered in the light of a punishment for sin," Milton was to write in *De Doctrina*, XIII. The broken faith that made the bark perfidious is that of *P. L.*, iv, 517-20 and viii, 325; and the sin of faithlessness is a sequel to Satan's own (*P. L.*, ii, 690, iii, 104). The bark is fatal because of Eve's "fatal Trespass"; because of the "fatal Tree" of which in Adam it partook; and because of Death's "fatal Dart" (*P. L.*, ix, 889, iv, 514, ii, 786). With so precise an organisation of the words and concepts to be used in *Paradise Lost* already formed at this point in *Lycidas*, it is not fanciful for those who choose to see the two-handed engine as Michael's sword, to point to a similar application of the epithet in that poem.

This compressed and crucial reply to the questions of the classical

gods defines both the origin and the scope of death. It looks back to the poem's initial view of death as occurring within nature; but by its very restriction of death to these terms, coming as it does immediately after the first revelation of a world beyond the mortal, it leaves the way open to the day-star's precedent for resurrection, and the might of "him that walked the waves."

Both the phrase and its meaning help to integrate Milton's poem into the over-all design of *Justa Edouardo King*. The phrase occurs in Hall's contribution, and refers to the ship:

The fatall bark's dark cabbin must inshrine
That precious dust. . . .

No model is required for Milton's adaptation of it to the human figure. One might be found in *The Faerie Queene*, III, iv, 8; another in *Pericles*, which Milton remembered in his poem (T. Banks, *M. L. N.*, 1947, p. 39):

He bears
A tempest that his mortal vessel tears. (IV, iv, 29-30)

Possibly a hint was taken from Briggs's contribution, which sees King as a ship "rigg'd and fraught With arts and tongues"; but indeed the image of man as a ship is a commonplace.

The theme itself, of man's subjection to death in consequence of Adam's sin, is that with which the collection opens. Henry King begins his introductory poem with an acceptance of "God's decree," that death shall be "executioner to destinie; Brought in by sinne." "But we have sinn'd, and now must bear the curse." The idea resident in the "fatall Bark" is important to an understanding not only of Milton's poem, but of the design of the whole collection. For Milton at the end of the book interprets the theme with whose statement the collection had opened.

The definition of the nature and limitation of death, begun by the "fatall Bark," is amplified by the vision of the "guarded Mount" and the saving dolphins. The guarded mount is no doubt to be seen as St. Michael's Mount, the fortification of a Christian country; but it is also the mount of Paradise where Adam walked with God, and from which, sword in hand, Michael drove him down (*P. L.*, XI, 320). For if the nexus of ideas in the "fatall Bark" was to be amplified in *Paradise Lost*, so was the concept of the mount. It is with Lycidas as Adam's inheritor that the poem is concerned, and paradise equally

to the expelled Adam was a mount (*P. L.*, XII, Argument). Thus the appeal to Michael to melt with ruth takes up and develops a major theme of the poem. Michael will be commanded: "from the Paradise of God *Without remorse* drive out the sinful Pair" (*P. L.*, XI, 104-5). The remorselessness of this expulsion is paired in the remorselessness of the natural elements of which man is now a part, and which are the agents of his death (*Lycidas*, 50). To mortal man his death in nature is as much a phenomenon of the remorseless punishment for sin, as the action of the Fury is a revenge for it. The Fury is properly a spirit of vengeance; and Milton substituted her for the Fates not out of ignorance, but to define the death she wields as a form of God's just revenge consequent on man's original sin.

Milton gives the remorseless response to man's sin thereafter two divergent directions. To those who do not learn "the faithfull Herdmans art," who remain "perfidious," mortal death is made final in the execution of the two-handed engine. We may well wish to see that as the sword of God wielded by the still remorseless Michael. But from the good shepherd, redeemed by Christ, the remorseless doom is lifted. Remorselessness in the instrument of God's justice is replaced by "ruth." Michael is besought to "melt with ruth"; to "look homeward," which is not merely to England, but to man's first home in the guarded mount of Paradise, or his ultimate home in heaven. So man who in his mortal part (as "fatall Bark") suffers death by the "remorseless deep," may be pitied by the very instrument of justice, and after mortal death recover his former oneness with God.

St. Michael's Mount thus carries associations with the mounts of paradise and of heaven (the latter probably linked by the dolphin reference to Parnassus). This we might expect from a poet writing with Spenser's May eclogue in mind. There the praise of mountains places alongside St. Michael's Mount both Parnassus and paradise. Only Milton has sided with Morrell and Mantuan's Candidus against Spenser himself, seeing the mountain not as a place of pride, but as one nearer to God.

What is it that makes it possible for man to be rescued from the "remorseless deep" and wafted to the heavens? The might of Christ will be stressed; but the immediate agents of salvation are dolphins. Dolphins are introduced in this function not because some decorative machinery was here required, and they had in myth saved the shipwrecked. It is more precisely because the dolphin is a creature who loves man's music, and is drawn through that love to save man; and

because in myth the dolphin may be no creature but Phoebus Apollo himself. Thus we are shown at this focal point first the repeal of ruthlessness; then that quality which enables man to take advantage of divine ruth to be saved. The quality is twofold. First it is that quality in man which, despite "disproportion'd sin," can hear that music which the poem shows to be of supernatural origin. Second, it is that in man which makes the music: that is in this poem, his function as feeder of the sheep. Because as music-maker he has fed the sheep, he will be admitted to the fold. The dolphin is both Apollo, the divine poetic voice; and the creature that hears and loves the music of that voice. Lycidas is to be wafted by that in him which, as poet, had both heard the god and preached the god's doctrine.

The dolphin reference has been incompletely interpreted because commentators have tended to suppose they must choose one or other of the youths of dolphin mythology. This is wrong. The one hapless youth of this line is Lycidas. The reference to dolphin mythology is through the word "dolphins"; and that is plural. It is an invitation to remember all dolphins who, as lovers of music, rescued man from the sea. Thus to ask whether Arion or Palaemon is the more hapless is irrelevant. All we need decide is to which of the many dolphin tales Milton wishes to allude in placing his plural reference at this point: that is, which best serve the poem's thematic structure.

Critical opinion has recently revived Palaemon's claim at the expense of Arion's. It need not have excluded either; but it has chosen the weaker. Palaemon's dolphin saved him by command: the tale does not properly belong to the myth of the dolphin's love of music. Nor does the fact that Palaemon died and Arion did not contribute to the poem at this point. To stress the death might have been fruitful at 1.50; here, where the defeat of death is the subject, it is irrelevant. If an allusion to Palaemon is useful, it is rather in reminding us that his death was at the hands of a divine avenger.

Two other dolphin allusions more creatively serve the poem here, and doubtless both are intended. The first is to the Arion myth. Arion, son of Poseidon, offended the god Apollo: a fact concordant with the meaning of the "fatall Bark" passage. Arion was the greatest poet of his day: he had no "peer"; and it is because of his marvelous song that the dolphin wafted him ashore. That song, Herodotus tells us, was in the high-pitched Orthian style (the word means "upright"), and may have been already in Milton's head when he underlined the "lofty rhyme" in an early draft. Arion's dolphin

and his lyre were placed in the heavens as stars: an allusion that not only takes us forward to the resurrection of the day-star, but resumes the poem's hitherto uncompleted Orpheus theme. For Orpheus's death has so far been only incompletely reported. It has stopped at the "watry bear," as was right at the point of limited enlightenment when it appeared. Death was then assumed to be final, and we were not reminded that the music of Orpheus won over Hades and released the dead, as Arion's music defeated death. Orpheus, priest of Apollo, was killed by those who would not worship the god. But his head was retrieved from the waters, through the intervention of Apollo and the Muses (that poetic impulse for which also the dolphins stand); and his lyre, like Arion's, was placed in the heavens: as a constellation. The Arion allusion has looked back to and completed the Orpheus allusion, at that point when its completion is appropriate. The Muses had only seemed unable to save. They were in fact able to translate their dead singer to the heavens.

But it is fruitful also to see the dolphin as a divine saviour. In the Arion allusion, the dolphin is that in man which is susceptible to music, the divine voice. In the myth of Icadus, it is that which inspires the music, Phoebus Apollo himself. Icadus's tale is preserved in a note by Servius to *Aeneid*, III, 332; and Milton had already read Servius, of whom he made use in *L'Allegro*, 14. In this tale, the youth is a son of Apollo. In their journeyings, his brother reached Italy (and we have been taught to see in Lycidas not only King's voyage, but a reference to Milton's own Italian journey); but Icadus was shipwrecked. His father, Apollo, in the form of a dolphin, wafted him to Parnassus.

Classical and Christian have met in a single reference; the one is now to be assimilated to the other. The mount incorporates Christian paradise and classical Parnassus. In the Icadus allusion both Parnassus and Phoebus Apollo are evoked. They are to be transformed to a Christian deity and a Christian heaven. Phoebus, the name Milton gives to Apollo, is used in the anthology's third poem for the sun. Milton's "day-star" is not only a reference to Christ; as the sun, it recalls Phoebus, and incorporates Apollo into the now dominant figure of Christ. Apollo's Parnassus is likewise modulated into a Christian heaven; and Lycidas, compared with the Icadus whom Apollo carried to Parnassus, is now by the "dear might" of Christ wafted to the heaven of an "unexpressive nuptial song." The collection of elegies opened with a statement of death as God's punish-

ment of sin. The concluding poem has strictly defined and limited that which is sunk "beneath the watry floor." It is the body's "fatal Bark"; the singer within it is saved.

University College, Staffordshire

MICHAEL LLOYD

Milton's Eve and the Evening Angels

In *Paradise Lost*, iv, 449-76, Eve tells about her creation just as Adam (viii, 250 ff.) will eventually describe his to Raphael. We remember that after Eve awakened from her dream she went to a nearby pool, wherein she saw a "Shape" so beautiful that she would have "pined with vain desire" forever had not a voice told her that she was looking at and loving herself. It has long been observed that Milton is here suggesting the tragic flaw of self-love in Eve and annotators at once saw that the Ovidian story of Narcissus set the pattern for the passage. But whenever Milton is obvious there is likely to be a subtle hint on the underside of the obviousness. Raphael is at the moment of Eve's narrative on the way to tell Adam about how the angels fell, and Eve's autobiography looks toward this later narrative.

The angels, we know, fell on the first day of Creation. As soon as God separated light from darkness, says Hugo of St. Victor, some angels chose the light and the others fell into darkness.¹ What Hugo is saying in this somewhat mystic section of the *De Sacramentis* points backward to the *De Genesi ad Litteram* of St. Augustine. The Bishop of Hippo is faced with expounding "And the evening and the morning were the first day." This is how he does it. When the angels were created they looked first at themselves, surprised at their own existence. Then some looked upward and found the source of creation in the Word. Others fell in love with themselves and sank in their own darkness.² This solid distinction between the angels of light and those of darkness, between the morning and evening angels became part of the Christian tradition, and is authoritatively restated by St. Thomas.

¹ Op. cit., *PL*, 176, 194-5.

² Op. cit., *PL*, 34, 311.

instans primum in Angelis intelligitur respondere operationi mentis angelicae, qua se in se ipsam convertit per vespertinam cognitionem; quia in primo die commemoratur vespere, sed non mane. Et haec quidem operatio in omnibus bona fuit. Sed ab hac operatione quidam per matutinam cognitionem ad laudam Verbi sunt conversi; quidam vero in se ipsis remanentes facti sunt nox, per superbiam intumescentes.³

This item is no treasure reserved for the Romans, but quite current enough for John Donne to spend on his congregation in 1621:

The Angels fell in love, when there was no object presented, before anything was created; when there was nothing but God and themselves, they fell in love with themselves, and neglected God, and so fell in *aeternum*, forever.⁴

We now see how Eve's story fits the piece. Immediately after her creation, she falls in love with herself. She was more fortunate than the angels, because the Word conveyed her to the thing that she was created to love. Adam, after being amazed at his own existence, passes rapidly through the whole gamut of religious evolution,⁵ and finds the Word. The story of the two varieties of angels is repeated in them.

The Johns Hopkins University

D. C. ALLEN

The Twin Motif in

"The Fall of the House of Usher"

Since Poe's practice of the short story is obviously based upon the principle of scrupulous execution—the studied manipulation of "a certain *single effect*"—the function of structural details would seem to warrant the most careful critical examination. But this kind of attention has not generally been given to "The Fall of the House of Usher" (nor, for that matter, to the other tales of emotional and mental perversion). Its distinctive unity of plot and tone has excited little more than perfunctory comment, and the crucial importance of the twin motif in the preconceived design has virtually been ignored. Yet the Gothic convention of the common fate of twins is the chief

³ Op. cit., I, Q. 63, a. 6.

⁴ *Sermons*, ed. Simpson and Potter (Berkeley, 1957), III, 254.

⁵ D. C. Allen, "The Scala Religionis in *Paradise Lost*," *MLN*, LXXI (1956), 404-5.

vehicle both of Poe's effect of terror and of his psychological rationalization of the terror.

The "invented" action and ambience of the story, while seemingly mechanical modes of suspense, are actually diversiform projections of Roderick's compulsive absorption with the appalling folk superstition about twins, what he calls "the grim phantasm." Indeed, the narrator's report of background, scene, and incident is always focussed on the implications of Madeline's illness. The opening description of the "sickening" decay of the external setting symbolically figures the hero's physical and mental condition. However, in the reminiscence which immediately follows, this state is connected with the "undeviating" male line of descent in the Usher race, a hereditary deficiency directly affecting the sister's future destiny. In present time this emphasis is extended by the introduction of the sinister physician who is treating her mysterious disease. The succeeding symptoms of Roderick's "acute bodily illness" and "mental disorder" are part of this same pattern of relations, for he despairingly associates "the nature of his malady" with her sickness: "He admitted, however, although with hesitation, that much of the peculiar gloom which thus afflicted him could be traced to a more natural and far more palpable origin—to the severe and long-continued illness—indeed to the evidently approaching dissolution—of a tenderly beloved sister, . . . 'Her decease,' he said, with a bitterness which I can never forget, 'would leave him . . . the last of the ancient race of the Ushers.'" Confirming evidence that the twin motif controls the development of suspense is found in Poe's elucidation of Roderick's inexplicable reactions to Madeline's death and subsequent burial in the underground vault, actually the frightful apprehensions attending his conviction that he too ought to be dead: "There were times, indeed, when I thought his unceasingly agitated mind labored with some oppressive secret, to divulge which he struggled for the necessary courage." Structurally, the later revelation of the significance of this ravaging obsession is made to coincide with the climactic moment of terror, Madeline's fateful resurrection.

Her miraculous escape from the closed coffin and the locked tomb is, of course, a *tour de force* of Gothic sensationalism. But to limit its meaning to this view alone is to ignore its symbolic function, for the incident is the chief agency of the psychological disclosures in the story. Though Roderick's dissociation of personality has countless external correlatives, from the fissure in the house to his physical and

intellectual idiosyncrasies, his psychic condition, in the casual sense, cannot be clearly understood unless it is directly related to the illness of his twin sister. Madeline, like the other William Wilson, Ligeia, and the pursued criminal in "The Man in the Crowd" (a story often misread because the pursuer, the first-person narrator, is not recognized as the protagonist), is a visible embodiment of the alter ego. She stands for the emotional or instinctive side of her brother's personality which has stagnated under the domination of the intellect (here the tarn is a dramatic image). But as attested by the interior poem, a synecdoche of this conflict and its outcome, these repressed feelings will ultimately revolt against such tyranny. This turn of events is symbolized in the disappearance of the house and its occupant (the head and its monarch "Thought" in the poem) into the storm-tossed waters of the tarn. In sum, the outraged unconscious swallows up all conscious authority, and Roderick is rendered completely insane. As Madeline escapes her death-in-life confinement on the literal level of action, on the psychological level the instincts (or alter ego) attain their release. Thus the two levels of reality in the tale are brought into perfect conjunction, and the twin motif is the structural device that controls the final synthesis of form and, inevitably, of tone.

Washington and Jefferson College

WILLIAM BYSSHE STEIN

A Gloss on *The Red Badge of Courage*

To understand fully the implications of Stephen Crane's *The Red Badge of Courage*, a short story, "The Veteran,"¹ must be taken into consideration. The novel ends on an ambiguous note: is Henry Fleming a hero *manqué* who has gained the outward semblance of courage by his battle exploits but who still shows the egotistic lack of moral integrity that forced his original act of cowardice and his later betrayal of the tattered soldier—a betrayal that he cannot forget even after his triumphs—and his lies? Or has the youth actually matured through his war experience and learned the true meaning of fear and duty as well as the nature of combat?

¹ John Berryman has noticed that the hero of the novel appears in the story, but Berryman does not show the connection between the two works. See John Berryman, *Stephen Crane* (New York, 1950), p. 324.

"The Veteran," which was published a year after the novel in *The Little Regiment* (1896), is important in this connection, since it provides the author's own comment on the value of Henry's war ordeal. In the story, the aged veteran (who, we learn, rose to the rank of orderly sergeant during the war) admits that he was terrified in his first battle.

'The trouble was . . . I thought they were all shooting at me. Yes sir, I thought every man in the other army was aiming at me in particular, and only me. And it seemed so darned unreasonable, you know.'²

The old man admits that he ran—to the shock and disappointment of his hero-worshipping grandson. The little boy, like young Henry, has a romantic illusion of war. The old man, however, is the same Henry Fleming who has come through the horror described in the novel to learn that a man may run and run and yet in the end be a good soldier, and that war is neither heroic nor pretty but a duty and grim. But he is no longer the liar he was in the novel, although the truth alienates his grandson.

Henry Fleming also appears briefly in one of Crane's Whilomville stories, "Lynx-Hunting" (1899). The tale, interestingly enough, is built around a lie. Young Jimmie Trescott pretends to have a vast knowledge of guns and hunting for

. . . it was not in the rules for the conduct of boys that one should admit anything whatsoever, and so Jimmie, backed into an ethical corner, lied as stupidly, as desperately, as hopelessly as ever lone savage fights when surrounded at last in his jungle.³

The youth lies, just as young Henry did, ". . . they all lied carefully about their courage."⁴ But old Henry, understanding that it is the nature of youth to lie and be afraid, forgives the boy for shooting a cow.

In other words, Crane, like Conrad in *Heart of Darkness* and Fitzgerald in *The Great Gatsby*, measures maturity by the ability to distinguish between a selfish avoidance of truth (Henry's refusal to explain his wound, Kurtz's betrayal of his mission, Jordan Baker's cheating at golf), and the kind of positive, "white" lie that hurts

² Stephen Crane, "The Veteran," *The Little Regiment* (London, 1897), p. 144.

³ Stephen Crane, "Lynx-Hunting," *Whilomville Stories* (New York, 1900), p. 20.

⁴ Crane, *Whilomville Stories*, p. 23.

no one, not even the teller (Henry's forgetting the past after he has proved himself, Nick's protective lies to old Gatz, Marlow's distorted version of Kurtz's last words).

The stories are more than an afterthought on Crane's part. As an author, he was willing to let *The Red Badge of Courage* remain ambiguous; within the artistic construct of the novel, the uncertainty adds a dimension of reality. But as an individual, Crane was less willing to leave the character of Henry, a figure who would obviously be identified with his creator, in doubt; outside of the book's framework, the author was deeply disturbed by the problem of courage and fear in battle.

Crane was obsessed with the need to prove the validity of his vision of war, to deal with the "mystery of heroism," as he entitled one of his war stories. He had to show that he was not himself a coward—thus his heroics in the Greco-Turkish and Spanish-American Wars.

"The Veteran" clears up an ambiguity that gave intensity to a work of art but raised a question in the minds of some of Crane's critics, who cast doubts on the conception of Henry Fleming.⁵ The story can be taken as Crane's defense of the hero—and the author.

"The Veteran" proves that even though Henry Fleming, at the end of *The Red Badge of Courage*, may seem unchanged, he has actually learned honesty and self-abnegation. He acts out this notion in the last hours of his life when he insists upon the truth to his grandson and later repeatedly plunges into a burning barn to rescue a drunken Swede and the animals. The veteran dies as a calm, unheroic individual doing his best for society. The last words of the story show that quiet devotion to duty leads to the real glory and that selflessness raises one above the mass of men. "The smoke was tinted rose-hue from the flames, and perhaps the unutterable midnights of the universe will have no power to daunt the colour of this soul."⁶

The Ohio State University

ERIC SOLOMON

⁵ See, for example, the attack by General A. C. McClurg, *The Dial*, xx, No. 231 (Feb. 1, 1896), 80.

⁶ Crane, *The Little Regiment*, p. 150.

Henry James's Use of the Word *Wonderful* in *The Ambassadors*

Like Vereker, the novelist, in Henry James's story, "The Figure in the Carpet," James leads his readers and critics in and on by discussing in his preface to the 1909 Scribner edition of *The Ambassadors* the theme, the point of view, and the dramatic scenes, but he does not discuss the resolution of the theme, nor does he discuss the aesthetic device by which he ties together resolution and art.

This device is his use of the word *wonderful* more than sixty times in *The Ambassadors*. It remains inconspicuous because James often uses it humorously as well as in its straightforward sense. He takes the word through an exceedingly wide range of nuances, overtones, and ironies, and on the last page he gives it to Maria in a way to include the gamut of meanings. James's resolution, which is the hero's preservation of his integrity, is bound to his art through the ambiguous meanings of the word *wonderful*.

Wonderful is first used on page 40¹ by Maria Gostrey following Strether's description of Mrs. Newsome:

"And is wonderful," Miss Gostrey asked, "for her age?"

... "I don't say she's wonderful. Or rather," he went on the next moment, "I do say it. It's exactly what she is—wonderful. . . ."

But Maria is too penetrating. She is "the very deuce," and she forecasts the irony of Strether's remark when, much later in the conversation at the London theatre, page 47, she says of Mrs. Newsome in connection with the Review that Strether edits for her, "She's just a *moral* swell."

The next five uses of the word are single, more casual than the first, but they too have their ironies. On page 85 Maria says to Strether concerning the influences in Paris on Chad, "But on our hypothesis, you know, they must be wonderful." In another early use of the word, page 112, Strether is writing home "of his original encounter with the wonderful lady," that is, Maria. This statement, by the time the Pococks arrive, has become ironic, for Maria is part of Strether's equivocal position.

It is not until page 140 at Gloriani's party that James's grand plan for the word emerges. Here and on the two pages following it appears

¹ All references to *The Ambassadors* in this paper are to the Modern Classics edition (Harper & Bros., 1948).

eight times, beginning with Miss Barrace's exclamation, "'Mme. de Vionnet? Oh, oh, oh!'" [she] cried in a wonderful crescendo." In the conversation with Little Bilham and Strether which follows, Miss Barrace uses *wonderful* seven times. Three are general gushers. Another two on page 141 are humorously ironical concerning Waymarsh: "He'll resist even Miss Gostrey: so grand is it not to understand. He's wonderful." And two paragraphs down, "He doesn't understand—not one little scrap. He's delightful. He's wonderful." On the next page, "'And the way he sits, too, in the corner of my room, only looking at my visitors very hard and as if he wanted to start something! They wonder what he does want to start. But he's wonderful,'" Miss Barrace once more insisted. 'He never started anything yet.'" As Miss Barrace's conversation with the two men draws toward its end, Strether asks her why she has said "Oh, oh, oh," following Mme. de Vionnet's name.

She easily remembered. "Why, just because—!
She's wonderful."

"Ah, she too?"—Strether had almost a groan.

The first and last uses of *wonderful*, both connecting with Miss Barrace's three "oh's," emphatically establish this word as descriptive of Mme. de Vionnet. The middle applications of *wonderful* to Waymarsh, humorously overdone, establish the word as belonging to Miss Barrace's manner of speaking, and Strether's "almost a groan" at the end clinches it as Miss Barrace's own word. But Miss Barrace has inoculated Strether, and from his inoculation arises a series of new applications. On page 144 he thinks "that Chad himself was, more than ever, in Miss Barrace's great sense, wonderful." On page 248 Chad has just told Strether that Mme. de Vionnet is prepared for Sarah Pocock: "Strether took it in; then as if an echo of Miss Barrace were in the air: 'She's wonderful!'"

On page 323 at Chad's party for Sarah, Miss Barrace and Strether have another conversation, which continues to the end of the chapter. Strether feels that "nothing yet had been so 'wonderful' between them as the present occasion." Between Strether and Miss Barrace is their insight into what Chad has done to make the party a success. Strether says of the responsibility for a successful party, page 324:

... "My own isn't so firm, *my* appetite for responsibility isn't so sharp, as that I haven't felt the very principle of this occasion to be 'the more the merrier.' If we *are* so merry, it's because Chad has understood so well."

"He has understood amazingly," said Miss Barrace.

"It's wonderful!"—Strether anticipated for her.

"It's wonderful!" she, to meet it, intensified; so that, face to face over it, they simply and recklessly laughed.

Chad has planned the party so that Sarah is "packed so tight she can't move. She's in splendid isolation." As James adroitly focuses on *wonderful*, he again gives the word to Miss Barrace and the over-tone to Strether, but he makes the ironic application to Sarah.

Actually Strether uses *wonderful* more often than Miss Barrace, but, of course, he is almost constantly in the scene, whereas Miss Barrace appears only occasionally. Strether, either in speaking or thinking, uses *wonderful* twenty-five times; Miss Barrace, fourteen. Strether's numerous uses of the word in his varied responses to and concerning Mme. de Vionnet reflect his attitude toward her.

First there is the build-up in his mind that she is wonderful. On page 285 Strether tells her, in tribute to her responsive intelligence, that she is as wonderful as everyone says. Little Bilham, Chad, Jeanne, and even Jim Pocock assist in the progress of the build-up. It reaches its farthest point in the "scene" with Sarah. During this encounter Strether heroically defends Mme. de Vionnet. On page 343 he finds "himself talking like Miss Barrace. 'She struck me from the first as wonderful. . . .'" All the time Sarah is denouncing Mme. de Vionnet, he stoutly and sincerely holds to his tenet.

At the dénouement, all Strether's previous references of *wonderful* to Mme. de Vionnet become ironic. As he reflects on the unexpected meeting in the country, *wonderful* takes an entirely different turn. He remembers, page 385, "that the wonderful woman's overflow of surprise was wholly in French," and on page 387 he is thinking, "From the point of view of presence of mind it had been very wonderful indeed, wonderful for readiness, for beautiful assurance for the way her decision was taken on the spot. . . ." The aura of *wonderful* is gone. A curious disillusionment surrounds it when James uses it to describe Mme. de Vionnet's ways of meeting the compromising situation.

A third turn of the word appears in Strether's mind when at Mme. de Vionnet's invitation he calls upon her for the last time. It is not she that is wonderful; it is her qualities that are wonderful. On page 398, Strether thinks, "What was truly wonderful was her way of differing so from time to time without detriment to her simplicity." On page 405 when she tells Strether that she would have liked to seem to him sublime, "He could only after a moment re-echo Miss

Barrace. "You're wonderful." At the point when Strether is most understanding and sympathetic with Mme. de Vionnet, he uses Miss Barrace's word, but now he means *wonderful* in Miss Barrace's sophisticated sense, not his innocent interpretation of her *wonderful*.

Little Bilham, Maria, Miss Barrace, and Mme. de Vionnet all think Strether wonderful for different reasons and in different ways. Strether even applies the word to himself humorously. On page 228 he becomes waggish with Maria. Concerning his news that a message from Waymarsh to America is sending the Pococks to Paris (ironically the same Waymarsh Miss Barrace says has never started anything yet), Maria says,

... "How wonderfully you take it! But you're always wonderful."

... "It's quite true. I'm extremely wonderful just now. I dare say in fact I'm quite fantastic, and I shouldn't be at all surprised if I were mad."

Much later in the book, page 413, Maria and Strether are discussing Little Bilham's lie. Maria is amused as Strether explains the technicality. "'What I see, what I saw,' Maria returned, 'is that you dressed up even the virtue. You were wonderful. . . .'"

At the end of the novel, page 429, Maria falls back on recollecting how at first they had wondered where he would "come out." "They had so assumed it was to be in some wonderful place. . . ." Strether says, page 432:

... "That, you see, is my only logic. Not, out of the whole affair, to have got anything for myself."

She thought. "But with your wonderful impressions, you'll have got a great deal."

Strether's "wonderful impressions" come from the whole range of his experience, beginning with his preconceived notions, continuing through his innocence, and ending with his insight. He keeps his impressions, and he keeps his integrity.

So it is that James weaves *wonderful* into *The Ambassadors*, tone and overtone in a texture of straightforwardness, humor, and irony, an elusive something in the "primal plan of the novel" like "a complex figure in a Persian carpet."² James's story, "The Figure in the Carpet," was written before *The Ambassadors* and apparently aimed at superficial criticism. But the figure Vereker discusses is an aesthetic device just as *wonderful* is in *The Ambassadors*.

Tipp City, Ohio

MARY KYLE MICHAEL

² Henry James, *Stories of Artists and Writers* (New York: New Directions, n.d.), p. 293.

George Peele and *A Farewell to Arms*: A Thematic Tie?

For several years now, critics have argued about the source and meaning of Ernest Hemingway's title, *A Farewell to Arms*. In doing so, two opposing theories have arisen: (1) that the "Arms" of the title refers to weapons and that the title has reference to Frederick Henry's desertion under fire; and (2) that the "Arms" of the title refers to Catherine's arms which Henry loses in her dying. The first of these theories would have the reader place the emphasis of the book on one of pacifism or, at least, of glorified irresponsibility. The second of these would have the reader place the emphasis of the book on its love story. Both admittedly are aspects of the novel, but a serious reader of Hemingway would find neither of these two emphases completely adequate.

The crux of the book for most readers lies in Henry's philosophical awakening, or, at least, in his awareness of things other than himself. This awakening occurs for readers when Henry, as he does in the following passage, begins to think of the consequences of his actions:

Once in camp I put a log on top the fire and it was full of ants. As it commenced to burn, the ants swarmed out and went first toward the centre where the fire was; then turned back and ran toward the end. When there were enough on the end they fell off into the fire. . . . I remember thinking at the time that it was the end of the world and a splendid chance to be a messiah and lift the log off the fire and throw it out where the ants could get off onto the ground. But I did not do anything but throw a tin cup of water on the log, so that I would have the cup empty to put whiskey in before I added water to it. I think the cup of water on the burning log only steamed the ants.¹

As this seems so, I should like to propose the consideration of a third theory as to the source and meaning of the book's title. Of the three, it is perhaps the simplest and most obvious since it merely assumes that Hemingway borrowed his title from the title of one of George Peele's poems, "A Farewell to Arms." Philip Young in his book, *Ernest Hemingway* (New York, 1952), pointed out this possible source but suggested no further connection between the two works other than their titles. I should like to suggest that a thematic tie exists, too, for the theme of Peele's poem seems to fit the theme of the novel much more adequately than the themes proposed by either

¹ Ernest Hemingway, *A Farewell to Arms* (New York, 1949), pp. 338-9.

of the other theories. For example, the first two stanzas of the Peele poem embrace not only the Hemingway shift from the profane to the spiritual but also, in certain words like "helmet" and "lovers' songs," both meanings given to "Arms" by previous critics. Beginning with a struggle between *Time* and *Youth*, the Peele poem proceeds to define the relentless changes that occur:

Beauty, strength, and youth, flowers fading been,
Duty, faith, and love, are roots, and ever green.

My helmet now shall make an hive for bees,
And lovers songs shall turn to holy psalms:
A man at arms must now sit on his knees,
And feed on prayers, that are old age's alms.
And so from court to cottage I depart;
My saint is sure of mine unspotted heart.²

In addition, these changes, when applied to Henry's character, account in part for Hemingway's choice of a title for the German edition of the novel. *In einem andern Land*, uttered by Barabas as "in another country" in Marlowe's *The Jew of Malta*, implies that the man who had committed fornication in that other country is not the same man who stands accused. Likewise the changes in character caused by love and war form the theme of Hemingway's story by the same title, "In Another Country," and serves to buttress this more serious intention in *A Farewell to Arms*.

As Peele's poem appeared under this title in an anthology of verse, *Corn from Olde Fieldes*, as recently as 1918, there is every reason to suppose Hemingway may have found both the poem and his title readily accessible in this volume.

University of Detroit

JEROME L. MAZZARO

Yeats's Arthurian Black Tower

"The Black Tower" is Yeats's last poem and is dated 21 January 1939—only a few days before his death. Most readers would agree that it is both haunting and beautiful, yet it has generally puzzled commentators. A vague surface-meaning can be deduced, but it

² George Peele, "A Farewell to Arms," *Corn from Olde Fieldes*, ed., Eleanor M. Brougham (New York, 1918), pp. 268-9.

obviously contains a profounder significance which, until recently, has remained obscure. There have, of course, been various discussions of the poem. Richard Ellman considers it in a fairly literal sense,¹ and Virginia Moore has suggested Rosicrucian influence;² but, valuable as these speculations are, they do not in my opinion penetrate deeply enough into the poem's potentialities. F. A. C. Wilson, however, in his recent book *W. B. Yeats and Tradition*, has gone a long way towards clarifying the poem, and has placed it firmly in Yeats's philosophical system. None the less, I suspect that there is an intermediary layer between the literal and philosophical meanings which has not yet been noticed.

Mr. Wilson interprets the poem in terms of the Heraclitean doctrine of the conflict of opposites. Life, he says, is presented characteristically in terms of war, and the poem follows Plotinus both in seeing the intellective soul as alone exempt from this warfare, and in symbolizing it as "an old watch-tower beaten by storms."³ "The soldiers," he writes, "represent subjective humanity, fighting for survival in a world where the principle of subjectivity is in eclipse."⁴ The ultimate source of the poem's philosophical and structural framework is, as Mr. Wilson has been kind enough to point out to me, the myth of the absent world-king in Plato's *Statesman*⁵ (sometimes called the *Politicus*). There the present age is seen as a godless cycle in which the ruler of the universe has withdrawn from active participation in the world. The survivors of the resultant upheaval, presented by Yeats as the soldiers, wait obstinately unmoved by the modern objective propagandists for the moment when the king, seeing the universe declining into chaos, resumes control. At that time the motion of the world will be reversed, and a new subjective gyre will commence.

What has not yet been pointed out is that Yeats seems to have presented this idea with reference to Arthurian legend. I suggest that there is an intermediary Arthurian layer of meaning which acts almost as a stepping-stone between the words on the page and the philosophical meanings which lie behind them.

¹ Richard Ellman, *The Identity of Yeats* (London: Macmillan, 1954), p. 209.

² Virginia Moore, *The Unicorn: W. B. Yeats' Search for Reality* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1954), p. 439.

³ Thomas Taylor, *Five Books of Plotinus* (London, 1793), p. 106. Cited by F. A. C. Wilson, *W. B. Yeats and Tradition* (London: Gollancz, 1958), p. 224.

⁴ Wilson, p. 226. For the discussion of the whole poem, see pp. 223-230.

⁵ For an interesting examination of the use of this myth by Blake and Yeats, see Kathleen Raine, "A Traditional Language of Symbols," *The Listener*, LX (9 Oct. 1958), 559-560.

The particular series of legends to which I refer are those concerned with Arthur's sleep in the Hollow Hill. It is most unlikely that Yeats, who was so familiar with popular mythology, would have been unaware of these tales. I quote the most relevant example from E. K. Chambers's *Arthur of Britain*:

Beneath the Castle of Sewingshields, near the Roman wall in Northumberland, are vaults where Arthur sleeps with Guinevere and all his court and a pack of hounds. He waits until one blows the horn which lies ready on a table, and cuts a garter placed beside it with a sword of stone. Once, a farmer, knitting on the ruins, followed his clew of wool which had fallen to a crevice and found the vault. He cut the garter and Arthur woke, but as he sheathed the sword, fell asleep again, with the words—

O woe betide that evil day
On which this witless wight was born,
Who drew the sword—the garter cut,
But never blew the bugle horn.⁶

There are various versions recorded in various parts of the country. In one, the visitor is frightened away by the horses champing in their stalls; in another, quoted by Christina Hole in *English Folk Heroes*,⁷ the intruder who takes flight is blown out by a whirlwind.

The connexion with Yeats's poem I take to be as follows. The soldiers (in this particular layer of meaning) are men who believe in the eventual return of King Arthur to lead the Celts to glory. They are the last survivors of the ancient heroic world which the new regime—"Base-born products of base beds," as he calls them in "Under Ben Bulbin"—has almost completely destroyed. But in spite of everything, these men remain faithful, firmly believing that Arthur is asleep in the tomb within the mountain, and will one day return. In the varying refrain, we get a description of Arthur and his knights waiting in the tomb, shaking as the "winds come up from the shore," knowing that one day the storms are going to herald a new gyre at which time they will reappear. Arthur, then, is their "own right king" of the second stanza, and the persistent rumours that "kynge Arthur is nat dede" are referred to in the lines:

If he died long ago
Why do you dread us so?

In the third stanza, the "tower's old cook" claims to have heard

⁶ Sir E. K. Chambers, *Arthur of Britain* (London: Sidgwick, 1927), p. 224.

⁷ Christina Hole, *English Folk-Heroes* (London: Batsford, 1948), p. 63.

"the king's great horn." In other words, someone has at last blown the bugle horn and set the Arthurian knights free. The soldiers are sceptical—"But he's a lying hound"—yet still remain true to their oath, and the final refrain which stresses the fact that "There in the tomb the dark grows blacker," suggests that Arthur's second coming is approaching nearer.

There are various incidental connexions which would have interested Yeats when he encountered any of these legends. One variation is that the bugle horn is sometimes replaced by a bell, and, as Mr. Wilson shows, Yeats consistently uses the image of a bell or gong beating at midnight as a symbol of the moment of death and the beginning of a new cycle. We may also detect here a reference to the trumpet heralding the Last Judgement, as Wilson notes. The variant in which the intruder is blown out by a whirlwind may lie somewhere behind the line "But winds come up from the shore," though Wilson gives an equally feasible Biblical source for this. Again, Arthur's association with the Wild Hunt might well have fused in Yeats's mind with the phantom horsemen of Knocknarea. We might even go so far as to suggest that the clew of wool, which occurs in another version as a thread leading directly into the vault, might remind Yeats of the spool upon which the thread of Time would be wound and reversed at the beginning of a gyre.

If this Arthurian reference is accepted, it also helps to explain the "tower's old cook" of the final stanza, which Wilson considered must be medieval, and which reminded him of the story of Beaumains and Kay. Sir Kay deteriorates in Arthurian legend; beginning as a worthy knight, he ends up as cook in the buttery and might with reason be considered "a lying hound." Whether there is any special significance in his action of "catching small birds" is uncertain, but it is just possible that Yeats had in mind an earlier passage in the *Statesman* where, in a careless classification of leaders and their herds, the king and the bird-catcher are found to be in competition.* I would not press any connexion here, though such an interpretation would be appropriate.

I believe this Arthurian layer of reference to be a missing link in our understanding of this difficult poem, and Mr. Wilson has accepted the general outline of my interpretation. I would like to stress that in my view this secondary Arthurian level strengthens Mr. Wilson's

* Plato, *Statesman*, 266.

exegesis. On the other hand, it does not detract from other readings of the poem such as Miss Moore's. The point of interest is that Yeats could simultaneously express his meaning at varying levels of intensity—in terms of philosophical myth, popular legend and poetic symbol. For a full appreciation of the poem's subtleties, each level must be seen as contributing an added significance to the others.

University of Toronto

W. J. KEITH

A Page in *Finnegans Wake* Explained

It is well known that the casual reader and the serious student encounter almost insuperable difficulties in hewing a path through the nearly impenetrable jungle of *Finnegans Wake*, for, according to Joyce, the Damocles sword of uncertainty hangs above our heads and everything is shrouded in fog. Deliberate obscurity is a central feature of his art; we hear a distorted whisper, the indistinct murmur of sleeping men. We move in a thick fog, and the outline of persons and events is blurred and hardly recognizable. Sometimes the fog rolls away, and we dimly perceive something, but next moment we are in the dark again, and painfully grope our way forward. This creates a painful, but also exhilarating tension. Added to this general picture of impenetrable darkness, there are a great number of special difficulties. One of them is that Joyce, a pupil of the Jesuits for ten years, lives under the dark cloud of a perverted and heretical catholicism. He struggled all his life—in vain, as it is plain to see—against the religion in which he was brought up, the religion of his family and of his country. He is an accomplished theologian; he hits out against the old enemy with violent blasphemy and travesty, and ultimately religion is transformed to the shirt of Nessus whose fiery flames torment and devour him all his life.

To elucidate an utterly incomprehensible page in *Finnegans Wake* will show that the critic has to equip himself with considerable theological learning, as Joyce never discloses his sources; that he has to apply weapons which are normally lacking in the instrumentary of the literary historian. It is plain to see that the main figure of *Finnegans Wake*, H. C. Earwicker, suffers from an all-pervading feeling of guilt and the whole immense dreambook is nothing but a

huge paraphrase on Earwicker's guilt and its hidden sexual causation. Guilt, after all, fulfills an important function in the dynamism of salvation, as expressed by St. Augustine in the famous *O felix culpa*-formula, and having once perceived how deeply influenced Joyce always is by catholic thought, albeit in its negative and heretic form, we shall not be surprised to find this formula repeated dozens of times, always in grotesque travesty and disguise: *O ferax cupla, O foenix culprit!*, etc. Joyce is attached to ancient catholic thought, for to him, as to the church fathers, a mysterious relation seems to exist between the original sin and sexual desire, *concupiscentia*, and this mysterious connection between guilt and sex dominates *Ulysses*, and to a much stronger degree, *Finnegans Wake*. Sex in all its conceivable forms and variations plays a tremendous role. Bloom's feelings and interests and, as far as something can be at all clearly perceived in the figure of Earwicker, his mind too, is dominated by abnormal sexual urges. The work of Joyce is permeated by sexual scenes which seem to be derived from the hellish visions of a Brueghel or Bosch. On the beach of Dublin Bloom experiences in the evening a strange love adventure *par distance* with a young girl, who, at first sight, appears to him pretty and desirable. When she leaves the beach at nightfall, it turns out that she is lame. At first sight she looked like the goddess of love, *Anadyomene*, rising in all her beauty out of the foaming sea; at the end she hobbles away, Venus on crutches!

A comprehensive depreciation of sex is one of the main trends of Joyce's world and this devaluation appears all the more acute as it is clothed in the spectral light of the writer's satire. Therefore Joyce is never obscene, for irony removes the alluring flavour. Parody establishes distance and Joyce describes the strange behaviour of the humans with the icy and unconcerned detachment of a Martian. Whether he likes it or not, he belongs to the great tradition of catholic confessors and theologians with their penetrating insight into human frailty and perversity, to the school of catholic casuists who have accumulated an immense store of knowledge illustrating human folly and degradation.

We are concerned here with two odd pages in *Finnegans Wake* 572-573 (English edition, London 1939), which we consider to be a cruel travesty of a *casus conscientiae* of one of the writers on casuistry and moral theology of the 17th century. An important aspect of religion is the establishment of an institutionalised set of fixed rules destined to liberate man from his real and imaginary, rational and irrational

feelings of guilt; salvation becomes then salvation from guilt. Joyce must have been well informed about the moral quarrels of the seventeenth century, between a rigorist wing, represented by the Jansenists, the spirit of which has been made immortal by Pascal's *Lettres provinciales* with their violent irony directed against Jesuit morale, and a milder tendency whose main exponents were the confessors and theologians of the powerful Society of Jesus. (Cf. *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* XIII / 1. col. 418-619. art. *Probabilisme*. Th. Deman.) It is not without importance to realise that this mild wing was strengthened further by the remarkable insight—300 years before Freud—which these old Jesuit confessors had acquired of the compulsionary character of many sexual symptoms. Great collections of case histories, *casus conscientiae*, were compiled for the guidance of the confessor in his daily practice. The *Resolutiones* of the Sicilian Theatine Antonin Diana (1585-1663) comprised no less than 20,000 cases. Other leading writers in this field were the Jesuits G. Vasquez (fl. 1580-1600) and F. Suarez (fl. ca. 1580-1610). As the sexual subject matter abounds in these collections, we often meet what is absurd, bizarre and lascivious. These books were still written and used well into the 19th century and we believe that Joyce must have been familiar with J. Gury's *Casus Conscientiae*, 1891. The names and stories are, of course, always fictitious and the names frequently used in Gury and other writers of this school, like Sigolena, Romaricus, Labanus, Romelia, Sapricius, Defrosa with their flavour of late antique and medieval Latin must have inspired Joyce in his Onuphrius story. One of the stories in Gury II, 395 ff. might have influenced Joyce directly: an aristocratic widow, Ludmilla, is in love with her son Julius and wants to sleep with him. She knows that every night he visits one of her maids and therefore she sends the girl away, under some pretext, and takes her place in the bed. Julius, without knowing it, sleeps with his mother. He then departs on a long journey and remains abroad 15 years. Ludmilla gives birth to a girl with which Julius after his return falls in love; and then in this complicated and Boccaccio-like mix-up all kind of complications ensue.

This then is the background which, as we believe, has inspired *Finnegans Wake* 572/73:

Honuphrius [the first syllable of the name indicates Joyce's sneering laughter] is a concupiscent exservicemajor who makes dishonest propositions to all. He is considered to have committed, invoking *droit d'oreiller*, simple infidelities with Felicia, a virgin, and to be practising for unnatural coits

with Eugenius and Jeremias, two or three philadelphians. Honuphrius, Felicia, Eugenius and Jeremias are consanguineous to the lowest degree. Anita, the wife of Honuphrius, has been told by her tire-woman, Fortissa, that Honuphrius has blasphemously confessed under voluntary chastisement that he has instructed his slave, Mauritius, to urge Magravius, a commercial, emulous of Honuphrius, to solicit the chastity of Anita. Anita is informed by some illegitimate children of Fortissa with Mauritius (the supposition is Ware's) that Gillia, the schismatical wife of Magravius is visited clandestinely by Barnabas, the advocate of Honuphrius, an immoral person who has been corrupted by Jeremias. Gillia (a cooler blend, D'Alton insists), *ex quo* with Poppea, Arancita, Clara, Narinuzza, Indra and Iodina, has been tenderly debauched (in Halliday's view) by Honuphrius, and Magravius knows from spies that Anita has formerly committed double sacrilege with Michael, *vulgo* Cerularius, a perpetual curate, who wishes to seduce Eugenius. Magravius threatens to have Anita molested by Sulla, an orthodox savage (and leader of a band of twelve mercenaries, the Sullivani), who desires to procure Felicia for Gregorius, Leo, Vitellius and Macdugalius, four excavators, if she will not yield to him and also deceive Honuphrius by rendering conjugal duty when remanded. . . . Fortissa, however, is encouraged by Gregorius, Leo, Vitellius and Macdugalius, reunitedly, to warn Anita by describing the strong chastisements of Honuphrius and the depravities (*turpissimas*) of Canicula, the deceased wife of Mauritius, the simoniac, who is abnegand and repents. Has he hegemony and shall he submit?

In these pages we have reached the bottom of the pit, the depth of the abyss. In mad gyration, only made tolerable by the distance created by glittering irony and sneering laughter, men and women, men and men, women and women clasped in one great orgy, reminding us of the *symplegmata* which according to an old tradition emperor Tiberius enjoyed at Capri.

Lincombe Lodge Research Library

MARCEL P. HORNİK

Ronsard's *Préface sur la musique*¹

The *Préface sur la musique* of Pierre de Ronsard was printed as the dedication to François II and with slight alterations to Charles IX of a *Livre des meslanges* published by Le Roy and Ballard in 1560 and again in 1572.² This little preface has always been highly

¹ The original version of this paper was read before the French Renaissance Section of the Modern Language Association at its meeting in Washington, December, 1956.

² The text may be found in the *Œuvres complètes*, ed. M. Prosper Blanche-

esteemed because it sets forth Ronsard's own ideas about music and poetry, to which there is frequent reference in his verse. But it is equally important for another reason of which little notice has been taken. Although quite brief, the work occupies a unique place among musical treatises from medieval times through the Renaissance, having evolved from certain definite antecedents and being not without influence upon later writers.

A glance at the various types of music treatises from the time of Boethius onwards will enable one to understand the tradition of which Ronsard's *Préface* was a part. Following Aristotle's division of all knowledge into theory and practice, writings on music tended to fall into a similar dichotomy—*musica theoretica* or *speculativa* and *musica practica*. Speculative or theoretical writings might again be classified according to the purpose of the author. For the student of philosophy there was the hortatory introduction similar to the philosophical *protreptikos*, pleading the necessity for the study of music by showing the benefits, divisions, and relationship with the other arts. It might be extensive (like the *Musica* of Boethius) or quite brief, like the many discussions of music in medieval encyclopedias of the seven liberal arts, outlining simply the scope, divisions, aims, and general usefulness of music as a part of *philosophia*, of general knowledge.³ For the student of music, on the other hand, there was the more specialized *eisagogé*, a direct introduction to the field of music, which began with the definition, etymology, invention, divisions, parts, uses, and benefits of music, and ended with a discussion of musical mathematics—formation of intervals and scales from mathematical ratios. Treatises on *musica practica*, however, dealing with music as an art rather than a mathematical science, were centered at first upon the plain-song of the Church, later upon sacred polyphony and its inevitable concomitant—problems of notation and rhythm; but generally such discussions of musical artistry were preceded by the conventional Scholastic *eisagogé*. Other types of medieval treatises need not detain

main (Paris, 1857-1867), vii, 337-341; *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Paul Laumonier (Paris, 1914-1919), vii, 16-20; Julien Tiersot, *Ronsard et la musique de son temps* (Paris, 1903), pp. 16-18. For an English translation, see Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History* (New York, 1950), pp. 286-289. Excerpts from the Blanchemain ed. are quoted here.

³ For a discussion of Boethius' treatise from this point of view, see Leo Schrader, "Music in the Philosophy of Boethius," *Musical Quarterly*, xxxiii (1947), 188-200. As examples of introductions to music in encyclopedic writings, the sections on music in the treatises *De artibus liberalibus* of Robert Grosseteste and *De ortu et divisione philosophiae* by Robert Kilwardby are typical.

us—the *scholia* or commentary, the musical lexicon, and the musical *speculum*, mirroring in one volume all knowledge of the theory and practice of music.

Ronsard's preface may be regarded as a generally hortatory treatise. His opening paragraph deals with music as a touchstone to man's character and contains a beautiful eulogy of the power of music to sway man's soul:

Sire, tout ainsi que par la pierre de touche, on esprouve l'or s'il est bon ou mauvais, ainsi les anciens esprouvoyent par la Musique les esprits de ceux qui sont genereux, magnanimes, et non forvoyans de leur premiere essence; et de ceux qui sont engourdiz, paresseux, et abastardiz en ce corps mortel, ne se souvenant de la celeste armonie du ciel, non plus qu'aux compagnons d'Ulysse d'avoir esté hommes, après que Circe les eut transformés en porceaux.

Ronsard continues with reference to the Pythagorean idea discussed by Plato that number (proportion, harmony) is the basis of the universe, of man, of all things; and he possibly recalls, too, Plato's advocating of music (in the *Laws* and elsewhere) as a very real part of the training of the young citizen in order to shape the soul harmoniously:

Comment se pourroit-on accorder avec un homme qui de son naturel hayt les accords? celuy n'est digne de voyr la douce lumiere du soleil, qui ne fait honneur à la Musique, comme petite partie de celle, qui si armonieusement (comme dit Platon) agitte tout ce grand univers. Au contraire celuy qui lui porte honneur et reverence est ordinairement homme de bien, il a l'ame saine et gaillarde, et de son naturel ayme les choses haultes, la philosophie, le maniment des affaires politiques, le travail des guerres, et bref en tous offices honorables il fait tousjours apparroistre les estincelles de sa vertu.

Next, the *Préface* actually outlines the Scholastic introduction to music, in hasty, enumerative fashion. Ronsard touches upon the definition, parts, and properties of music, and mentions the division into three *genera*, with a word about each taken verbatim from Macrobius' commentary on Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* (substituting "tous" for Plato in one instance):

... sa division en enarmonique, laquelle pour sa difficulté ne fut jamais parfaitement en usage: en chromatique, laquelle pour sa lascivité fut par les anciens banye des republiques: en diatonique, laquelle comme la plus aprochante de la melodie de ce grand univers fut de tous approuvée.⁴

⁴ In Professor William Harris Stahl's translation of Macrobius, *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio* (New York, 1952). The very thorough introduction and notes contain a full account of sources.

And he mentions the Phrygian, Dorian, and Lydian modes, with psychological effects attributed to each, illustrating these with several *exempla* from antiquity.

Following this embryonic *eisagogé*, our poet applies his aesthetic concept about the nobility of the man who loves music in direct address to the king, with flattering reference to the king's late father, Henri II. To give his point authority he recalls—without recounting—stories of rulers who had their sons brought up by musicians—Peleus and Achilles, Aeson and Jason. He then appeals once more to François II to enjoy the recreative powers of music as relaxation from the duties of statecraft.

Coming directly to the dedication, Ronsard explains the fact that the volume "est composé des plus vieilles chansons qui se puissent trouver aujourd'huy" by saying that "on a tousjours estimé la Musique des anciens estre la plus divine." This leads to a subject at the very heart of Ronsard's philosophy—the divine inspiration of poetry and music, all the more to be cherished because of its very infrequent appearance; and he lists ten musicians, active in the fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, who have exemplified this divine inspiration, headed by Josquin des Prés.⁶ The edition of 1572 adds one of the finest eulogies ever accorded Orlando di Lasso, who came to Paris in 1571 to be received with great acclaim at court:

Et de present le plus que divin Orlande, qui comme une mouche à miel a cueilly toutes les plus belles fleurs des antiens, et outre semble avoir seul desrobé l'harmonie des cieux, pour nous en resjouir en la terre, surpassant les antiens, et se faisant la seule merveille de notre temps.

The treatise ends with a reference to Plutarch and Boethius for further information, and a final plea for royal patronage of music.

From one point of view, then, Ronsard's *Préface sur la musique* continues the line of the old hortatory writings. From another, however, the preface typifies a distinct change, a trend characteristic of certain Renaissance treatises—that is, the hortatory introduction used as dedication to a wealthy patron, with emphasis upon the (good) psychological effects of music. The influence of music upon man, which ordinarily formed one of the indispensable points in the medieval *eisagogé*, now becomes the chief topic treated; a treatise may be

⁶ "Josquin des Pres, Hennuyer de nation, et ses disciples Mouton, Vuillard, Richafort, Jannequin, Maillard, Claudin, Moulu, Jaquet, Certon, Arcadet." Compositions of most of these appear in the book Ronsard is dedicating.

centered wholly upon it. Such a work is Ronsard's—a discussion of musical *ethos* as a direct plea to the king for continued support and patronage of music. His little treatise is not the first such work; but it is the most extensive, the best known of such dedications up to that time, and the first such introduction to music by a humanist primarily concerned with letters.⁶

The change which Ronsard's treatise exemplifies was directly related to the spread of humanism. With the introduction of Greek studies, musical studies received a new impulse, for music and poetry had been inseparable to the Greeks. Plato's remarks on music—never ignored, for Boethius had drawn heavily upon Plato and was a standard text in schools and universities throughout the Middle Ages and into the Renaissance—were rediscovered and highly regarded, especially his ideas about musical effects. Ancient works on music were translated into Latin and into the vernacular. Jacques Amyot's translation of Plutarch's *Peri mousiké* (1572), for instance, was not without effect upon the development of the *musique mesurée* of the French Renaissance composers.⁷ Indeed, France was unique in producing a large corpus of music arising out of humanistic studies: the so-called *musique mesurée à l'antique*, in which quantitative verse was set to music measured exactly according to the length of the syllables (half notes for long syllables, quarter notes for short ones) in what was thought to be Hellenic fashion.⁸ Nowhere were investigations into the music and poetry of the ancients pursued with more enthusiasm than in the Collège de Coqueret under the guidance of Jean Dorat, whose lecture hall, it is said, continually resounded to the strain of the lyre.⁹ Here Baïf developed the ideas of the true union of music and poetry which gave rise to his Academy of Music and Poetry. And

⁶ The *Musica* (1537) of Nicolas Listenius, for example, had a dedicatory epistle to the Elector of Brandenburg, but was a practical instruction book, lacking any speculative introduction. See my book, *Music in the Medieval and Renaissance Universities* (Norman, 1958), pp. 265-266. On Ronsard's frequent reference to music in his verse, see Constantin Photiades, *Ronsard et son luth* (Paris, 1925). See also his *Abbrégé de l'art poétique françois* of 1565 (Blanchemain ed., VII, 320) on the subject of poetry and music, and Tiersot (op. cit., pp. 12-14) for a list of his verse set to music by Renaissance composers.

⁷ See André Pirro, "L'Enseignement de la musique aux universités françaises," *Mitteilungen der internationalen Gesellschaft für Musikwissenschaft*, II (1930), 49-50, and John C. Lapp (ed.), *The Universe of Pontus de Tyard* (Ithaca, 1950), pp. 37-38.

⁸ D. P. Walker, "Musical Humanism in the Sixteenth and Early Seventeenth Centuries," *The Music Review*, II (1941), 1-13, 111-121, 220-226, 288-308; III (1942), 55-71.

⁹ Photiades, op. cit., p. 20.

here Ronsard, a skilled lutenist himself, was fired with interest in the divine inspiration of the poet and in the powerful effects of music upon men's souls.

Although Ronsard may have looked into Boethius and Plutarch, whom he mentions at the end of his dedication, it seems very likely that his chief source was an extremely lengthy and comprehensive work written by the musical philosopher of the Pléiade—the *Solitaire second, ou prose de la musique* of Pontus de Tyard, first published in 1552. Tyard's learned dialogue between Solitaire and his beloved Pasithée is a lengthy treatise of the hortatory type which becomes quite involved in long mathematical explanations of the formation of the Greek scales; but, as Ronsard was to do later, Tyard devoted a large part of his treatise to musical *ethos*. Moreover, Ronsard's listing of the usual topics treated in the Scholastic *introductio* could well be a résumé of a large part of Tyard's treatise, which deals with just these items, again in great detail. Most conclusive of all, however, are the *exempla* chosen by our poet to illustrate his statement about musical effects: he chooses two which appear not only in the same discussion in Tyard's *Solitaire second* but actually on the same page. For among other musical marvels, Ronsard relates

comme le Roy Alexandre oyant les chants de Timothée, devenoit furieux, et comme Agamemnon allant à Troye, laissa en sa maison tout expres je ne sçay quel Musicien Dorien, lequel par la vertu du pied Anapeste, moderoit les effrenées passions amoureuses de sa femme Clytemnestre, de l'amour de laquelle Égiste emflamé ne peut jamais avoir joyssance, que premierement il n'eut fait meschamment mourir le Musicien.

Tyard cites the Timotheus story (among several others) in explaining the warlike effects of the Phrygian mode; and he gives the story of Clytemnestra (which appears most infrequently in music treatises) in his discussion of the Dorian mode.¹⁰ Not only does Tyard give a number of such stories from antiquity, but he includes a modern example—a story about the lute-player Francesco di Milano, who, at a sumptuous banquet, “ravished” the listeners completely by his divinely languorous playing and then with a more vigorous tune restored their souls to them.¹¹ An even more curious incident is said to have occurred during the wedding festivities of the duc de Joyeuse in 1581. At a rehearsal of some of the music of Claude Le Jeune written for the occasion—Le Jeune was held in great esteem by his contemporaries

¹⁰ *Œuvres philosophiques* (Paris, 1587), p. 102 verso.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 103 recto and verso.

for the marvelous psychological powers of his music—a gentleman was moved to take up his arms and rush as if into battle, and then was calmed by a change in the music.¹² Such stories show that to the Pléiade and Baïf's Academy the power of music to sway men's emotions was not an empty theory but a very real phenomenon capable of revival in modern times.

Against such a background, Ronsard's treatise becomes more than a simple introduction to a book of songs. As to its influence upon subsequent writers and musicians, one can only speculate on the basis of certain similarities. Ronsard's eulogy of music as a touchstone to man's character (quoted above), is quite similar in idea to Shakespeare's lines in the *Merchant of Venice* (c. 1597):

The man that hath no music in himself,
Nor is not moved with concord of sweet sounds,
Is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils.

The musical setting of the first book of Ronsard's *Amours* by Anthoine de Bertrand in 1578 was preceded by a preface *Au lecteur debonaire*, in general concept very similar to Ronsard's *Préface*. Bertrand, however, like Ronsard himself, appears to follow Tyard in details—for instance, in the Timotheus story.¹³ In the "Trophées," a long section devoted to the musically gifted King David in the *Seconde Sepmaine* (1584), Du Bartas tells the stories of Timotheus and Clytemnestra in the same breath, exactly as in Ronsard's *Préface*.¹⁴ In England, Spenser possibly found inspiration in Ronsard's words. One of the earliest appearances of the Timotheus legend in England was in E. K.'s gloss to the October eclogue in Spenser's *Shepherd's Calendar*, 1579. Much of this commentary, like Ronsard's preface, is a little treatise on musical effects. The October eclogue, indeed, expresses again the idea central to the philosophy of the French poets: the divine inspiration of music and poetry and their power over man's soul. In the light of Spenser's great admiration for French Renaissance poets—Marot,

¹² Frances A. Yates, *The French Academies of the Sixteenth Century* (London, 1947), p. 59, and "Poésie et musique dans les 'Magnificences' au mariage du duc de Joyeuse, Paris, 1581," *Musique et poésie au xvi^e siècle* (Paris, 1954), pp. 241-264. See also D. P. Walker and François Lesure, "Claude Le Jeune and *Musique mesurée*," *Musica Disciplina*, III (1949), 158.

¹³ Anthoine de Bertrand, *Premier livre des amours de Pierre de Ronsard in Monuments de la musique française au temps de la Renaissance*, ed. Henry Expert, IV (Paris, 1926), Aij.

¹⁴ *The Works of Guillaume De Salluste Du Bartas*, ed. U. T. Holmes, J. C. Lyons, R. W. Linker (Chapel Hill, 1935-1940), III, 346.

Ronsard, Desportes—and his constant drawing upon them for inspiration, it is more than likely that his explanation of musical *ethos* culminating in the Timotheus story was influenced by Ronsard's *Préface sur la musique* as well as by Tyard's *Solitaire premier* and *second*.¹⁵

Whatever its influence, Ronsard's *Préface sur la musique* beautifully expresses the musical aesthetics of the Pléiade. It is a plea for that attitude toward music which stimulated the spread of Platonism in France, and the very humanism from which Ronsard's ideas sprang.

Montana State University

NAN COOKE CARPENTER

From Hack to Editor—Diderot and the Booksellers

On 27 June 1746 the abbé de Gua de Malves signed the contract giving him editorial direction of the encyclopedia to be translated from the English of Chambers and Harris. The other parties were of course David, Le Breton, Durand, and Briasson. The witnessing signatures were those of Diderot and d'Alembert.¹

These two, like the new editor, had previously been associated with the enterprise. Judging from the booksellers' accounts, all three had been employed on a piecework basis, as Diderot and d'Alembert continued to be under the abbé's editorship.²

The function of the abbé's subordinates was presumably no more than translation at so much per page. Aside from dictionaries and reference works (contract, art. 11), the accounts mention only four books borrowed or purchased during his regime for the use of contributors; these include himself, Eidous, and d'Alembert. His contract, it is true, envisages (art. 2) "augmentations" in the amount of "au moins deux cent cinquante feuilles d'impression," and promises (art. 4) "qu'il luy [l'abbé] sera remis environ cent-vingt planches,

¹⁵ For a detailed survey of the Timotheus story as it appears in musical treatises and literary works, see my article, "Spenser and Timotheus: A Musical Gloss on E. K.'s Gloss," *PMLA*, LXXI (1956), 1141-1151.

¹ L. P. May, "Documents nouveaux sur l'Encyclopédie" in *Revue de Synthèse*, xv-xvi (Feb.-Oct. 1938), separately paged 5-109 plus one unnumbered page. All mentions of contracts, wages, etc., refer to this publication.

² With rare exceptions all three are paid in multiples of 3 *livres* (francs). With the abbé's elevation to the editorship, the sums paid him tend to be rounded off to such figures as 500 *livres*, while his colleagues continue to receive multiples of 3 *livres*—presumably a page rate for translation.

contenant un grand nombre de desseins divers"; by the end of his tenure, in August 1747, little or none of this had been even begun—a fact which helps to account for his departure. In the meantime, the encyclopedic task can have been little but translation, a hack labor which engaged the two editors-to-be along with Toussaint, Eidous, and a number of quite forgotten quilldrivers, all of them at the same wage.

Diderot and d'Alembert were nonetheless distinguished a trifle from their colleagues. Gua's contract expressly makes them judges of the translations, with authority to have them redone if need be (art. 8). That Diderot already had ample experience in such work is well known; that d'Alembert should be given a similar authority may well indicate similar experience on his part. Whatever his promise or accomplishment in other fields, his employers in 1746 seem to have valued d'Alembert almost exclusively as an authority on translation.

The story has long been told³ that d'Alembert was made co-editor (with Diderot) of the *Encyclopédie* because of his prestige as a *savant*. If so, the booksellers give no indication of the fact. For what it is worth, the evidence points to the contrary. D'Alembert was indeed appointed, with Diderot, as editor, replacing Gua, on 16 October 1747, and he is named first in the booksellers' record of the engagement (19 October). But the same entry, which sets his total remuneration at 3000 *livres*,⁴ sets Diderot's at 7200. The difference is not explained. One may speculate that Diderot was given the greater responsibility as having the greater experience and skill in translating. In any case, d'Alembert's position seems to have been clearly less considerable.

His scientific prestige, on the other hand, was undoubtedly greater than Diderot's at this time. Already a member *adjoint* for the astronomy section of the Académie des Sciences in 1742, in 1746 he had been promoted *associé*. In 1745 he had obtained, as J. Bertrand puts it, "par une faveur spéciale et fort rare . . . étant encore adjoint, une pension de 500 livres sur les fonds de l'Académie."⁵ It may be doubted that his reputation extended far beyond the learned world, but there it was already established. And he obviously had influential friends. Yet in 1746 he was still content to work at piece rate in

³ Not, however, by Diderot's latest and best biographer, A. M. Wilson, whose account of these matters in *Diderot: the Testing Years* (New York, 1957) this paper is intended rather to amplify than to correct.

⁴ Wilson's figure of 2400 (op. cit., p. 80) represents 3000 minus 600 previously paid to d'Alembert. See May, op. cit., p. 21.

⁵ *D'Alembert* (Paris, 1889), p. 35.

the bookshops, and in 1747 his employers, none of them sentimental, set the virtually unknown Diderot above him. D'Alembert's prestige was apparently not a commodity that Le Breton & Co. were willing to buy.

The reason for their reluctance is perhaps not far to seek. The encyclopedia visualized in 1746 was to be a translation of English originals of already sound reputation, with some "augmentations" and plates. The abbé de Gua "étendra la partie des arts par préférence et taschera autant qu'il luy sera possible de la compléter" (contract, art. 2). Such multi-volume compilations were the specialty of the leading partners, Le Breton and Briasson,⁶ and both had been and would continue to be extremely successful with them. Their concern was commercial, not literary or ideological, and nothing could be less significant commercially than a translator's name on the title page. While Gua's contract stipulates that he "mettra son nom comme éditeur à la tête de l'ouvrage imprimé et qu'il nommera dans sa préface les personnes d'un mérite distingué qu'il aura consultées" (art. 3), this provision seems more likely to have originated with the editor than with the booksellers. From the publishers' point of view, the editor's function was to get the text in order and read the proof; the publishers and the compilation would then take care of themselves.

Between October 1747 and the appearance of Volume I in 1751, we know that the encyclopedic project underwent a radical change. The "augmentations" engulfed the originals, and the *Encyclopédie* came into being as an autonomous contemporary, and predominantly French work. And consequently, whatever the booksellers may have thought, the names of editors and contributors took on decided importance. Diderot especially, aided no doubt by his already established colleague, seems to have embarked upon an active pursuit of scientific respectability.

⁶ Both were remarkable men whose careers invite particular study. Le Breton, the only one of the four associates who was *imprimeur* as well as *libraire*, provided one-half of the capitalization of the *Encyclopédie*, the others one-sixth each. Le Breton is described in a police record dated 1 January 1752 as "un fort honnête homme et très à son aise, qui fait fort bien ses affaires" (BN, Ms. fr. 22107, f. 91). Briasson is outstanding among the other three. As secretary for the group, he kept the books for the duration of the enterprise. In his profession, according to the police, at least, "il ne vend que de bons livres et est très riche; C'est un homme très assidu chez luy et attaché à son commerce qu'il entend parfaitement; il est dans de fort belles entreprises. . . . On l'appelle Le Corsaire de la Librairie, parce qu'il vend excessivement cher" (Ms. fr. 22106, f. 242, 1 January 1752). He appears in a number of notarial repertories as a man of business who had the confidence of many both in and out of the book trade.

The transformation from publisher's hack to editor is visible in Diderot's own account of his literary activities.⁷ "Je donnai d'abord l'*Histoire de Grèce* de Temple Stanyan." *Je donnai*, suggesting his own initiative, seems rather strong; I am unable to find a passage in the French which does not faithfully reproduce the English. "Je fus employé [more modest and more accurate] pendant près de trois ans au Dictionnaire de Médecine"—published, like the Stanyan book, by Briasson. Both books are publishing ventures typical of Briasson: competent translations of useful works whose reputation is sound and above all uncontroversial, excellent examples of book manufacture designed for a clientele at once intellectually curious and well heeled. So too, presumably, for the voluminous "*Antiquités ecclésiastiques* de Bingham," had it been completed and published; it would have been another translation of an esteemed English authority, grist wholly appropriate for Briasson's mill, and by the same token unlikely to arouse much missionary zeal in the translator.

For we notice that while the Stanyan is a relatively small publication in-octavo, the James appears in six large folio volumes, and the English Bingham in ten octavos.⁸ Diderot regarded all three books highly; at the same time, if we consider his ebullient temperament, his poverty, and his obscurity during the middle 1740's, together with Briasson's obviously solid success in his business, it seems probable that the impulsion for Diderot's labors therein came rather from Briasson than from himself. In other words, when Diderot was called to witness the Gua contract, he was and had been working as a more or less regular employee in Briasson's shop at least since 1742 (Stanyan), and he would so continue until assuming the editorship of the *Encyclopédie*.

Having done so, he begins his little campaign, with the evident cooperation of Briasson and his partners. "Je publiai . . . mes *Essais sur différents sujets de mathématiques*; mon but dans cet ouvrage, que je composai en travaillant aux *Antiquités ecclésiastiques* de Bingham et en dirigeant le *Dictionnaire universel des sciences et des arts*, était de prouver au public que je n'étais pas tout à fait indigne du choix des libraires associés."

If one takes this statement at its face value, as I do, the intentions

⁷ Letter to Berryer, 10 August 1749, published by P. Bonnefon, "Diderot prisonnier à Vincennes," in *RHL*, VI (1899), 212.

⁸ The *Catalogue des imprimés* does not specify number of volumes. Diderot, many years later and possibly from memory, says ten (*Plan d'une université* in A-T III, 516, n. 1).

of "cet ouvrage" seem clear. The author wishes to exhibit his thorough competence in mathematics, especially in applied mathematics. At the same time, he has tried to treat his topics "d'une façon qui fût à la portée de la plupart des lecteurs," not, he admits, with complete success: two of the five memoirs demand special knowledge, but the other three can be read "sans presque aucune teinture de mathématiques."⁹ In other words, he is displaying his ability as both specialist and vulgarizer, meanwhile, incidentally, solemnly abjuring "la marotte et les grelots."¹⁰ And as for the author, so too for the publisher: Briasson's partner Durand, together with Pissot,¹¹ have outdone themselves in presenting the memoirs in a format de luxe.¹² It appears improbable that in mid-1748 Diderot had either the money or the reputation to procure such an edition on his own behalf. It would seem more likely that the publication was intended to offer to the serious public, the prospective purchaser of the *Encyclopédie*, a sample of the very best on the part of both editor and publisher.

The editor tried another approach to scientific renown, whose failure is recorded in the following transcript from the manuscript register of the Académie des Sciences for 1749.¹³ On 8 February "Mrs. de Réaumur, Nicole et Clairaut Pensionnaires, Mrs. l'abbé Nollet et le Marquis de Courtivron, Associés Mécaniciens, ayant présenté à l'Académie pour la place d'Adjoint Mécanicien vacante par la promotion de Mr. de Courtivron, Mrs. Darcy, Didrot [sic], le Roy, et Genti, la pluralité des voix a été pour Mrs. Darcy et le Roy." Whatever his rivals' qualifications, Diderot's sole claim to academic recognition at this time was the mathematical memoirs, while on the other hand he was known or suspected to be the author of such non-academic productions as the *Bijoux indiscrets*, *L'Oiseau blanc*, the *Promenade du sceptique*, and the *Pensées philosophiques*. He had excellent reason to know that his candidacy was extremely shaky, not only because of the paucity of his accomplishment, but also because in all probability he was working, in the winter 1748-1749, with a man far more eminent than he, Jean Philippe Rameau, on the memoir representing the latter's second attempt to obtain that same

⁹ Avertissement de l'auteur, A-T IX, 81.

¹⁰ A-T IX, 79.

¹¹ Durand and Pissot were married to sisters.

¹² Descriptions in A-T IX, 75-76, and Wilson, op. cit., p. 89.

¹³ I am indebted to MM. les Secrétaires perpétuels of the Academy for granting me access to the archives.

recognition.¹⁴ Diderot's rejection is hardly surprising. It is interesting that he should have been nominated.

He was of course in close association with the academician d'Alembert, whose interest in the success of the great enterprise was presumably as lively as his own. It is possible also, if Malesherbes's extraordinary account of Diderot's relations with d'Aguesseau is true, to suppose some encouragement or even intervention on the chancellor's part. And Le Breton was not without friends at court, notably Chancellor d'Aguesseau himself—witness the alacrity and ease with which the publisher's perfectly legal contracts with Mills and Sellius were annulled (August 1745),¹⁵ thanks to the chancellor's personal attention.

These facts, such as they are, may be simple coincidences. Lacking other evidence concerning Diderot's nomination, one may conjecture that the latter is attributable not to the candidate's merits, but to the frank, perhaps even cynical, employment of personal influence to promote the commercial and "literary" success of an expensive publishing project. If this were so, there would be nothing shocking about it; on the contrary, Le Breton and his cohorts would have been foolish indeed not to exploit the facilities available to them. Success in 1749 (as, perhaps less flagrantly, in other times) depended upon the use of position and influence to foster particular interests. The famous piety of d'Aguesseau¹⁶ did not deter him from enabling Le Breton to defraud Mills and Sellius. The gentleman to whom the *Encyclopédie* would be dedicated was, for no discernible legitimate reason, a member of the Académie des Sciences. If, as I suggest, Diderot's candidacy was part of an advertising campaign, along with the "coquette" edition of the mathematical memoirs, it is amusing

¹⁴ See Wilson, op. cit., pp. 88-89, and my article forthcoming in *PMLA*. "J'ai donné," says Diderot in his letter to Berryer, "*l'Exposition du système de musique de M. Rameau*," and Rameau duly read it to the Academy in November. But neither Rameau's system nor Diderot's redaction of it achieved the desired result.

¹⁵ May, loc. cit., pp. 8-9, and Wilson, op. cit., pp. 76-77. For Diderot-d'Aguesseau see Wilson, pp. 81-82. The police note quoted above says of Le Breton: "Son adresse à faire sa Cour est grande lui [sic] a valu la préférence [sic] sur d'Houry [either the father-in-law or the brother-in-law of Le Breton] qui devoit avoir naturellement l'Almanach Royal."

¹⁶ It is Malesherbes, as far as I know, who is responsible for the term *pious* almost invariably bestowed upon d'Aguesseau by those (even Professor Wilson) who write of his role in the story of the *Encyclopédie*. The facts, or alleged facts, of that story should make it evident that the minister's piety did not noticeably intrude upon his functions.

to wonder whether or not his candidacy had the support of the comte d'Argenson.

All the foregoing, conjectural as so much of it obviously is, tends to indicate that, at its inception, at least, and of course always from the booksellers' point of view, the *Encyclopédie* was seen simply as a potentially profitable speculation. That it became nevertheless the epitome of its time and the manifesto of a new era in the career of western man emerges as a fascinating, if minor, irony of modern history.

Ohio State University

JAMES DOOLITTLE

Nodier: *Le Vieux Marinier*

Charles Nodier, antiquarian, philologist, bibliophile and short story writer was one of the last of a generation that expected its intellectuals to be of catholic taste and encyclopedic mind. His range and depth of knowledge set him apart in the early nineteenth century as a figure from an era that had vanished with the French Revolution. Yet it was his adaptability and flexibility of interest that made it possible for him, an established author, to side with the romantics in 1823, when others of his age were treating the young writers as irresponsible lunatics.

Nodier could well sympathize with their position. He, too, had been an innovator and had suffered sharp critical rebuff for his audacity. In his modest way he had also been a poet, adequate, but not talented. Though noted primarily for introducing vampirism, dreams, and the exoticism of Illyria into French literature, he remained young at heart with his fairy tales, many of them in verse.

The young romanticists welcomed his aid and recognized in him a sponsor of considerable status. Furthermore, his work contained elements from the eighteenth century that were to slip unchallenged into early romanticism. In the following selection,¹ for example, Nodier used the ancient device of the testament in verse to bemoan

¹The holograph MS consists of four pages on laid paper, 26 by 20 centimeters, with the text recto only on each page. The MS, which is signed by Nodier, was the gift of Mr. Feinstone to the Lena R. Arents Rare Book Room, Syracuse University Library. Although the fragment bears no date, it seems to come from Nodier's later work.

the cruelty of life. The philologist in him played happily with unusual sea terms; the eighteenth-century writer recalled the graveyard poetry once in vogue; and the romantic in him built his verse around the emotional content of poetry written by a man who committed suicide because he had lost his wife and daughter, and hence his reason for living. The resultant fragment not only mirrored Nodier's own thoughts late in life, but followed the recipe for the kind of lachrymose poetry that was so successful during the first years of the nineteenth century.

Le Vieux Marinier

Extrait du journal d'un voyage dans les mers du nord.

. . . un jour enfin où nous n'avions besoin à la vérité que de quelques vivres frais et d'un peu de radoub, et où rien ne nous pressoit de mouiller, un mauvais vent traversier nous jeta sur des rochers qui avoient, de hazard, par devant eux, un beau fond de sable et de coquilles où l'ancre mordoit comme un charme, de sorte que nous en fûmes quittes pour quelque avarie de plus dans les bossages. C'étoit accident et non *misfortune*, comme dit l'anglois, car nous pouvions, selon toute apparence, tenir la mer longtemps encore, quand nous ne serions pas accostés par un des bâtimens de la flotille, et nous laissâmes aller notre vie, comme un vaisseau en dérive, au cours de la Providence.

Nous avions à bord un vieux matelot qui avoit reçu d'un *midshipman* du *Lennox* (Dieu le convoie!), je ne sais quelles lettres au dernier port où nous primes terre. Il étoit porté dans les contrôles sous le nom de Mathieu Pérard, et plus connu de l'équipage sous le nom de *savant*, parce qu'il parloit à l'aumônier en latin; digne et bon homme d'ailleurs, à taille longue et élancée, mais qui avoit fléchi aux manœuvres, et qui regardoit plus aux écoutilles qu'à la hune; pale de teint, triste de visage, économe de paroles, et le devant de la tête fort dépourvu de cheveux, quoiqu'il n'eût pas cinquante ans à le voir; du reste grand amateur d'herbes curieuses, de singes et de perroquets. Le second jour que nous étions sur cet ilot de pierres, il se brula la cervelle à côté d'un trou qui étoit commode pour recevoir un cadavre, et il laissa près de lui des vers que tout le monde trouve détestables, mais que je me propose depuis longtemps de publier dans le premier recueil qui en voudra. Les voici donc:

Oh! si l'homme naissoit deux fois à la lumière,
que je tenterois peu les destins du nocher!
et de quel soin plus doux que ma chaîne première,
j'attacherois mes jours au seuil de la chaumière
comme l'huitre au rocher.

Non, je ne suivrois plus une proue écumante
qui broie en poudre d'or les flots étincelants,
et je n'épirois plus, de la vague fumante,

le phoque au regard bleu qui crie et se lamente
sur des rochers tout blancs.

non, jamais je n'irois sur la foi d'une prame
jouer ma vie errante au caprice des eaux;
non, jamais l'Océan n'humecterait ma rame,
quand le temps recoudroit tous les nœuds de ma trame
à d'éternels fuseaux.

Qu'ai-je fait sur la mer, et qu'y ferois-je encore?
quelle moisson produit le flot que j'ai frayé?
De quelle île propice ai-je gravi l'acore,
et le sang répandu dont la pourpre décore,
quel prix me l'a payé?

Est-ce brâver assez de Ciels et de Neptunes,
léguer à mille écueils d'assez tristes lambeaux,
avoir assez commis de changeantes fortunes
aux vents que fatiguoient nos voiles importunes,
pour trouver des tombeaux?

Qui mieux que moi pourtant sût calfater l'étrave,
hâler sur la bouline ou tenir le timon?
et, pour nous déborder d'un mauvais fond de grave,
qui fût jamais plus prêt, plus adroit et plus brave
à tourner l'artimon?

Qui mieux que moi surtout, et d'une main moins lente,
sût jeter sur la prise un grappin triomphant,
quand la lame bondit sous la nef chancelante,
et qu'aux efforts des airs une vergue hurlante
vagit comme un enfant?

Mais mon cœur s'envoloit au sil de la carême
comme une jeune abeille aux parfums de l'Hybla,
et j'aurois délaissé les amours d'une reine,
pour affronter de près les chants de la Sirène,
et les chiens de Scylla.

Car je lisois Homère, et mon âme empressée
des froids âpres de l'Ourse et des feux du Lion,
n'avoit pas un désir et pas une pensée
qui ne prisât plus haut les travaux d'Odyssée
que l'orgueil d'Ilion.

Et, quand d'un vif essor je déflois les mousses,
comme un oiseau marin perché sur les huniers,
je ne voyois que bois tout veloutés de mousses,
et je rêvois partout l'abri des pamplemousses,
Eden des maotoniers.

C'est ainsi qu'apparoit l'Océan de la rade.
Le voyageur de mer est fou comme l'amant.

tout visage nouveau lui paroît camarade,
tout lougre, galion, et tout poisson dorade,
et tout roc diamant.

il en est autrement quand bouillonne la houle,
quand le grain élargi noircit ses flancs massifs,
quand la foudre s'abat sur le mât qui s'écroule,
et quand, ras comme un bac, le vaisseau sombre ou roule,
de rescifs en rescifs.

aujourd'hui, bon espoir vous reste à la hélée.
Les marcheurs ont leur cap en plein de votre bord,
et si quelque lutin, tapi sur la coulée,
n'égare pas encor leur aiguille affolée,
vous surgirez au port.

La nature prodigue à vos chasses heureuses
promet les albatros et les fous étourdis,
sous des pitons, chargés de mouettes peureuses,
d'où tombent frissonnants les petits des macreuses
par le froid engourdis.

La tortue arrondit ses épaules nacrées
sous cette herbe marine aux mobiles scions,
et des cayeux béants les bouches déchirées
vous livreront ce soir, au reflux des marées,
le nid des alcyons.

Moi, j'ai filé du cable et ma tâche est remplie.
j'ai serré trop de lofs, j'ai rasé trop de bancs,
et j'ai trop entendu grincer l'aigre poulie,
quand l'aquilon mordant sous qui le beaupré plie
siffle dans les haubans.

J'ai changé maintenant de projet et d'allure,
et, quand vous vogueriez aux jardins de Circé,
je prends pic. j'ai ferlé ma dernière voilure,
et je n'étendrais pas d'une deule encablure
mon trajet insensé.

j'ai cherché comme vous, marinier intrépide,
le péril pour l'argent, l'argent pour le péril.
que me fait désormais la perle à l'œil limpide,
et l'opale inconstante où brille un feu rapide,
et l'azur du béril?

En quelque lieu nouveau que le destin vous porte,
Dieu vous gard'. mon espoir n'en a plus de souci.
Un esprit de malheur, s'est assis à ma porte.
mon toit est déserté. ma pauvre femme est morte.
ma fille l'est aussi.

Et quand, au champs natal que vient baigner la Manche,
les gémeaux protecteurs me conduiroient tout seul,
Verrois-je Marguerite en habits de Dimanche,
pour son bonnet de fête et pour sa robe blanche
dépouiller son linceul?

Ma Lise, viendrait-elle, espiègle et rebondie,
d'un pas alerte et sûr aider mes pas pesans?
Et moi qui me flattois de la trouver grandie,
car on n'a jamais vu de vague plus hardie
danser sur les brisans!

je ne conteroais plus, au feu de la veillée,
ce que pour les revoir un père peut oser;
la mère palpitante, et de larmes mouillée,
tandis que la petite à ma joue éraillée
colleroit un baiser! . . .

"Apporte-moi, dit-elle, une perruche verte! . . ."
qui la demanderoit de l'œil et de la main?
Lise est morte! —adieu donc! adieu, la *Decouverte*!
mais une salve encore à la tombe entr'ouverte
où je couche demain!

Ch. Nodier.

Syracuse University

ALBERT J. GEORGE

L'Invention poétique et l'automatisme mental

"L'idée de surréalisme, écrit André Breton, tend simplement à la récupération totale de notre force psychique par un moyen qui n'est autre que la descente vertigineuse en nous, l'illumination systématique des lieux cachés et l'obscurcissement progressif des autres lieux, la promenade perpétuelle en pleine zone interdite. . ."¹ A cet effet Breton préconisait, dans le premier *Manifeste du Surréalisme*, l'usage de l'automatisme mental sous toutes ses formes; et principalement celui de l'écriture automatique, du récit des rêves, auxquels vinrent s'ajouter plus tard l'"objet surréaliste" et la "trouvaille." Il y définissait le surréalisme comme "un automatisme psychique pur par lequel on se propose d'exprimer, soit verbalement, soit par écrit, soit de toute autre manière, le fonctionnement réel de la pensée. Dictée de la pensée, en l'absence de tout contrôle exercé par la raison, en

¹ André Breton, *Second Manifeste du surréalisme* (Paris: Kra, 1930), p. 23.

dehors de toute préoccupation esthétique ou morale.”² Roland de Renéville résume la doctrine en ces termes: “. . . la nécessité pour le poète de se laisser écrire, sans qu’il y ait lieu pour lui d’intervenir sur les mots qui se font jour à travers lui.”³

Ces assertions posent, et résolvent à leur manière, le problème difficile de la création poétique dans son rapport avec le langage. Est-on en droit de confondre le processus de l’invention avec l’enregistrement passif d’expériences mentales qui ne laissent dans le langage spontané de l’instant qu’une trace imparfaite et discontinue? Les poètes se feraient-ils vraiment “les sourds réceptacles de tant d’échos”? Une telle conception de la poésie relève de la méthode descriptive, elle tend à créer des figures statiques, des documents plutôt que des œuvres vivantes. Elle pêche dans la mesure où elle identifie l’expression verbale immédiate avec les forces psychiques cachées “en pleine zone interdite,” dans les régions du rêve et de l’enchantement, et substitue à la continuité de celles-ci le dénombrement fragmentaire de l’écriture automatique.

Pour juger des principes de Breton, il faut reprendre un à un les éléments mis en jeu dans la méthode décrite. Quels rapports entretiennent entre eux le rêve, le récit du rêve, l’automatisme mental, l’écriture automatique, et le “fonctionnement réel de la pensée”? Comment faut-il envisager leurs relations avec la poésie? Breton met un signe d’égalité entre tous ces termes: le rêve et son récit, l’automatisme mental et l’écriture automatique expriment indistinctement la “réalité supérieure” de la pensée et se confondent nécessairement avec la poésie. Reste à savoir si ces équations se justifient, ou si elles remplacent la vérité psychologique par un cercle de synonymes qui l’éludent.

Examinons d’abord les notions que cultive une certaine critique de notre temps sur les liens du rêve et de la poésie. Certes, il existe une parenté entre ces deux formes d’activité intérieure. La source d’énergie affective dont vivent les images mentales semble plus apte à se manifester dans un état de coupure où l’être gagné par le sommeil cesse d’agir utilitairement: encore est-ce au prix de la communication de ces images, proprement ineffables, et sujettes seulement à décalque verbal. La transe hypnotique et le rêve ne constituent cependant pas un état idéal, dans lequel l’impulsion pure de l’esprit créateur ou le “Mystère” d’André Breton se livreraient directement au regard

² *Manifeste du surréalisme* (Paris: Kra, 1929), p. 46.

³ Roland de Renéville, *L’Expérience poétique* (Paris: NRF, 1938), p. 55.

explorateur. Les "formes d'associations, négligées jusqu'à lui," que le surréalisme provoque par l'intermédiaire du rêve transcrit ou de l'écriture automatique, possèdent-elles vraiment une "réalité supérieure"? Comme nous l'indique Breton au début du premier *Manifeste*, tout le mouvement repose sur cette croyance.⁴ On peut la mettre en doute. Comme dans l'allégorie de Claudel, le roi secret de l'âme reste à jamais caché derrière la Muraille intérieure. A l'état de veille et dans le rêve on n'en devine la présence que par l'ombre interceptée et projetée sur l'écran des formes objectives par le travail de l'imagination. C'est ainsi que, dans la Genèse, selon certains exégètes, les anges ou Elohim créèrent Adam en laissant tomber leur silhouette sur le limon, et le formèrent à l'image de leur ombre où Dieu lui-même ne s'était point révélé.

Si l'on examine les caractères principaux de l'activité onirique et de la création de l'art, on se rend compte que le rêve, comme la vision extérieure du monde, remplit les conditions exigées par Croce pour la seule expression esthétique. L'existence séparée du rêve, de la nature, et de l'art, est la meilleure critique que l'on puisse élever contre le concept esthétique de Croce. Le rêve est vraiment une œuvre d'art au sens de Croce, une perception formelle à base affective du type "intuition-expression." Mais son milieu d'épanouissement, et le mécanisme auquel il obéit, sont sans rapports immédiats avec l'univers spatialisé où se meuvent notre corps et notre esprit éveillés.

Comme toute œuvre d'art le rêve est particulier, il s'achève chaque fois sur lui-même: c'est une expérience totale que l'on ne saurait transposer directement dans une autre sphère d'existence (par le récit qu'on en fait, ou par le procédé du rêve éveillé dont se prévalait Desnos), ni généraliser autrement que sous l'aspect imagé du mythe. Reverdy, parlant de l'expérience directe des sens, fait une remarque qui s'applique aussi bien ici: "Les sensations sont le combustible du néant. Inutile de les noter, de les embaumer. Elles ne ressuscitent, avec leur sève et leur parfum, que lorsqu'elles ressurgissent on ne sait plus d'où—quand on les avait oubliées—qu'elles sont retordues, transformées, adaptées au moment précis où elles doivent être libérées. Non plus pour être exprimées elles-mêmes, mais pour exprimer."⁵ La poésie s'accommode mal de l'exploitation brutale de l'esprit. Il lui

⁴ *Manifeste du surréalisme*, p. 46.

⁵ Pierre Reverdy, *Le Livre de mon bord* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1948), p. 217.

faut des étendues de silence et d'oubli qui la nourrissent, lui donnent le temps d'éclore, de s'ouvrir à elle-même.

Le rêve rétrécit le rôle du langage jusqu'à en faire un instrument accessoire, dont il se passe souvent tout-à-fait, pour lui substituer l'action pure, exactement comme dans la vie pratique. Le rêveur est un homme très occupé. C'est ici l'image animée qui domine et incarne la psyché, à laquelle revient le rôle principal dans l'expression interne du rêve.

La poésie, au contraire, confie au langage la fonction exercée par l'imagination motrice dans le rêve. Elle secrète la substance même du sentiment poétique, mais le "décrit" aussi peu que les images mouvantes du rêve expliquent le sens du songe au rêveur. Celui-ci s'identifie avec la scène rêvée comme l'amateur de poèmes avec la page lue. Aux yeux du lecteur poème et langage se confondent pour le désigner lui-même; ainsi l'image de rêve est une avec la personne qui la subit.

Prendre les images oniriques découvertes par "l'illumination systématique des lieux cachés" pour matière d'un poème ou d'un tableau (Breton parle du "modèle intérieur" dans son essai sur le *Surréalisme et la peinture*), c'est tenter d'en faire une reproduction, une description maladroite, effectuée au mépris de la différence radicale entre les milieux d'expression imposés par le rêve et le langage articulé. Valéry nous met en garde contre cette erreur: rien de plus difficile que d'écrire son rêve, et rien de moins spontané. Le résultat ne saurait être qu'une approximation plus ou moins grossière et schématique.

C'est là une première objection que l'on peut élever contre le principe surréaliste: l'analogie finale du rêve et du poème empêche tout saut de l'un à l'autre, toute utilisation immédiate de l'un pour l'autre dans le processus créateur. Les critiques du Symbolisme nous ont utilement rappelé que la poésie n'était pas la musique. Il serait opportun aujourd'hui de nous faire souvenir des différences qui séparent le rêve de la poésie. C'est abuser du sens des mots que d'assimiler le poète créant à l'esprit qui songe dans le sommeil. Tous deux certes peuvent nous captiver, mais combien divergents sont leurs moyens!

L'expression poétique n'est pas tenue de se référer aux conditions de l'état de rêve, dont l'automatisme de Breton est une forme affaiblie. et au fond assez suspecte—("Placez-vous dans l'état le plus passif, ou

réceptif, que vous pourrez . . ."). Elle ne leur doit aucune fidélité : appliqué ici, ce mot n'a pas de sens. Les poètes ne sauraient se réduire à de "modestes appareils enregistreurs."

Paul Eluard le reconnaît, qui écrit en 1939 dans *Donner à voir* : "On ne prend pas le récit d'un rêve pour un poème. Tous deux réalité vivante, mais le premier est souvenir, tout de suite usé, transformé, une aventure, et du deuxième rien ne se perd, ni ne change." Le rêve, création automatique, et l'art, création active du moi, sont deux formes très différentes de vision spirituelle. L'un nous sépare du monde, nous livre sans défense et sans voix aux monstres de la vie préconsciente. L'autre nous le rend transformé, baigné par la lumière de notre nouvelle connaissance, intégré à nos fibres les plus secrètes qui trouvent en lui leurs attaches.

Notre plus grande intimité, écrit Pierre Reverdy, nous ne pouvons l'exprimer qu'avec des matériaux qui nous sont extérieurs et étrangers. Ce sont les objets dont un peintre se sert—ou le poète les mots qui les désignent—qui deviennent les moyens d'expression les plus près, les plus propres à rendre ses sentiments et ses idées sensibles et intelligibles. Parce qu'ils sont la forme que ses sentiments et ses idées doivent prendre, ils deviennent lui-même autant qu'il est obligé de devenir eux-mêmes. De sorte que si un peintre ne peut jamais mieux s'exprimer qu'en employant la mer, l'autre des ponts jetés par-dessus des torrents, l'autre des femmes nues et le dernier des pommes, il n'y a qu'à regarder comment chacun traite ou maltraite ces différents objets pour trouver le niveau de son pouvoir humain, et le secret total de sa conscience d'artiste.*

Pierre Reverdy décrit ici le mécanisme de "l'introjection active" analysé par Ferenczi et esquissé par Freud dans son étude sur l'identification. Il nous paraît suggérer aussi la critique de l'imagination matérielle, dont Jung et Bachelard ont exploré les structures dans leurs ouvrages sur les archétypes de la conscience collective et la psychanalyse des quatre éléments. Une telle démarche, mettant à nu le pouvoir de transformation concrète de l'impulsion affective, nous fera probablement pénétrer plus avant dans les arcanes de la création poétique que le recours à l'automatisme mental. Breton, dans ses ouvrages plus récents, semble s'orienter lui-même dans cette direction : il exalte le mythe primitif de la résurrection, parle de la nécessité d'un "détour par l'essence,"⁷ qui, en temps de crise, substitue à l'actuel faussé une image parfaite de l'inactuel dont la substance est éternelle.

* Pierre Reverdy, "La Nature aux abois," *Revue Verve*, II (8: 1940), 54-55.

⁷ André Breton, *Arcane 17* (New York: Brentano's, 1945), pp. 29-30.

Affirmant l'identité de la poésie et du rêve, le premier *Manifeste* proclame également leurs affinités étroites avec l'automatisme verbal, qu'il assimile à la pensée authentique. Dans sa définition célèbre du mouvement surréaliste, Breton entend exprimer le fonctionnement réel de la pensée *par l'écriture automatique*, de préférence à toute autre méthode, si l'on en juge par l'ordre dans lequel il range les différents moyens.

Cette idée implique l'identité immédiate de la "réalité supérieure" de l'esprit avec ce mode d'expression particulier, d'origine extérieure et conventionnelle, qu'est une langue écrite. Bien mieux: Breton nous apprend dans "Les Mots sans Rides" que ceux-ci vont dorénavant "commander à la pensée."

Si nous pénétrons dans les intentions du *Manifeste* de 1924, Breton établit une équivalence entre la pensée libérée et l'automatisme mental d'une part—(la pensée réduite à un instinct psychique)—, entre l'automatisme mental et la technique de l'écriture automatique d'autre part—(cet instinct psychique réduit à un instinct verbal); enfin, entre ce dernier et la création poétique. Deux problèmes se posent; ceux-là justement qu'évite Breton en postulant, par un acte de foi, l'identité profonde des termes mentionnés. Essayons au moins de les formuler clairement.

Dans quelle mesure peut-on affirmer que l'écriture automatique, où intervient non seulement le langage appris dans les rapports sociaux, mais encore celui des livres et des écoles, donne une transcription authentique du "fonctionnement réel de la pensée"? Sans prétendre exprimer la psyché entière, dont Breton ne veut voir que certains aspects, traduit-elle l'automatisme mental proprement dit, avec ses composantes affectives et imaginatives, ses manifestations paralogiques ou parfois étrangement rationnelles?

Quelle que soit la réponse apportée à ces questions dont il ne suffit pas de se débarrasser par simples décrets, reste à savoir jusqu'à quel point on s'en servira pour expliquer la nature de la création poétique. Est-on en droit de faire dépendre exclusivement celle-ci, soit de l'automatisme mental pur, soit de l'automatisme verbal en jeu dans la "dictée" surréaliste?

La théorie sur laquelle se fonde le *Manifeste* de 1924 et les écrits antérieurs de Breton recueillis dans *Pas Perdus*, affirme que notre vie intérieure, consciente et inconsciente, se fait à partir des mots. Elle estime que le reste de notre activité psychique est illusoire ou ne compte pour rien. L'impulsion affective elle-même, qui est à la

racine de la pensée manifestée, serait de nature verbale. En tout cas, elle n'acquerrait de valeur ou d'efficacité qu'au niveau de l'univers nominal.

Dès lors la technique surréaliste se justifie. L'automatisme linguistique posséderait une assise primordiale dans l'esprit créateur. On pourrait assimiler le langage, même orthographié, à un instinct psychique magnifiquement développé qui se serait spécialisé au cours de l'histoire humaine en donnant à chaque tribu ses mots. Du point de vue psycho-génétique, il n'y aurait pas rupture entre la matière verbale inconsciemment agrégée, et l'état mental profond de l'être absolu, qui tendait à passer du monde improféré des émotions et du rêve dans celui de l'écriture ou de la parole articulée.

Ainsi, nul acte de la volonté, nul effort vers l'expression ne serait requis pour accrocher l'un à l'autre le langage et la pensée. Le poème, assemblage verbal, naîtrait d'un état affectif ou imaginatif comme surgit l'écume à la pointe extrême d'une vague, de l'océan tout entier qui la supporte et partage sa nature marine.

Nous trouvons ici la marque d'un nominalisme extrême. Cette tendance caractérise les écrits les plus importants de la jeunesse de Breton. Elle s'affirmait déjà dans les œuvres théoriques antérieures au *Manifeste*. Nous lisons dans l'*Introduction au discours sur le peu de réalité*, qui lui est à peu près contemporain, et dont le titre semble révélateur :

Les mots sont sujets à se grouper selon des affinités particulières lesquelles ont généralement pour effet de leur faire recréer à chaque instant le monde sur son vieux modèle. Tout se passe alors comme si une réalité concrète existait en-dehors de l'individuel, que dis-je, comme si cette réalité était immuable. Mais, je l'ai déjà dit, les mots de par la nature que nous leur reconnaissons méritent de jouer un rôle autrement décisif. Rien ne sert de les modifier puisque tels qu'ils sont, ils répondent avec cette promptitude à notre appel. Il suffit que notre critique porte sur les lois qui président à leur assemblage. La médiocrité de l'univers ne dépend-elle pas essentiellement de notre pouvoir d'énonciation? . . . Qu'est-ce qui nous retient de brouiller l'ordre des mots, d'attenter de cette manière à l'existence toute apparente des choses? Le langage peut et doit être arraché à tout servage. Plus de descriptions d'après nature, plus d'études de mœurs. Silence,—afin qu'où nul n'a jamais passé, je passe. Silence!—Après toi, mon beau langage.⁸

Dans le second *Manifeste* Breton fait allusion à "ces produits de l'activité psychique . . . aussi indépendants que possible de tout ce

⁸ André Breton, "Introduction au discours sur le peu de réalité," *Commerce*, III (Hiver 1924), 47-49.

qui n'est pas la vie passive de l'intelligence, ces produits que sont l'écriture automatique et les récits des rêves. . . . Le tout est qu'il (l'homme) continue à parler tout le temps que dure cette mystérieuse sonnerie; c'est en effet par où il cesse de s'appartenir qu'il nous appartient."⁹ Le principe nominaliste ressort bien, ici, du parallélisme établi entre la parole automatique et le mystère psychique commun à toute l'espèce humaine, qu'elle est censée transcrire intégralement.

La doctrine surréaliste orthodoxe nie l'autonomie de la sensibilité et l'antériorité de la conscience individuelle; elle l'ignore, ou lui refuse toute signification primordiale: "Après toi, mon beau langage." Elle est fondée sur une interprétation métaphysique du monde, et sur une théorie de la nature de l'esprit, qui feraient du mot,—c'est à dire de la convention arbitraire liée aux accidents de l'histoire,—l'unique réalité et la seule méthode possible de connaissance. Nous ne sommes pas loin de la thèse extrême que soutient Carnap dans ses études sur la structure logique du langage.

C'est réduire étrangement le domaine et la force de l'esprit.

"Le langage, écrit Jules Monnerot, n'est qu'une zone moyenne que bornent à ses deux frontières extrêmes l'algèbre et l'ineffable, la mathématique et le couple mystique-musique. Il n'est qu'un auxiliaire rétif, il faut que d'autres puissances sachent le tenir en bride, l'abandonner même à l'occasion pour quelque moyen plus adéquat."¹⁰ Valéry nous dit ce qui se passe en lui quand il essaie de "remplacer les formules verbales par des valeurs et des significations non verbales, qui soient indépendantes du langage adopté. J'y trouve des impulsions et des images naïves, les produits bruts de mes besoins et de mes expériences personnelles. *C'est ma vie même qui s'étonne*, et c'est elle qui doit me fournir, si elle le peut, mes réponses, car ce n'est que dans les réactions de notre vie que peut résider toute la force, et comme la nécessité de notre vérité."¹¹

Il semble que le secteur le plus important de l'univers intérieur soit ainsi contourné dans l'interprétation que nous donne Breton de la vie mentale! S'il existe des relations évidentes entre l'intention intellectuelle et la réalisation verbale qui la retrace en symboles plus ou moins abstraits, une certaine continuité de l'une à l'autre que l'on appelle le sens des mots ou du discours, *l'identité substantielle de la*

* Ibid., pp. 54-55.

¹⁰ Jules Monnerot, *La Poésie moderne et le sacré* (Paris: NRF, 1945), p. 145.

¹¹ Paul Valéry, *Variété V* (Paris: NRF, 1945), p. 135.

pensée et d'un langage parlé, postulée par Breton, ne nous paraît pas correspondre à la vérité:

L'homme pour l'œil humain n'est qu'une vision.
Quand tu veux remonter de ta langue à ton âme,
Néant. Ton propre fil en toi-même est rompu.
Tu ne sais pas ton verbe et veux savoir le Sien.¹²

Un abîme originel se creuse entre le langage et le réel. La réfutation du nominalisme prométhéen qu'entreprend Victor Hugo dans ce poème de *Dernière Gerbe* s'applique également au principe de l'écriture automatique.

Il y a disparité, non seulement entre la pensée logique et la construction grammaticale comme l'a montré Charles Serrus,¹³ mais encore entre la pensée imaginative du poète, ses intuitions ontologiques pénétrées d'affectivité, et les structures linguistiques qui sont leur contrepartie extérieure ou leur approximation dans l'ordre du symbole. A défaut de la transmutation si particulière qui caractérise l'acte poétique total, et ne se retrouve qu'en lui, le langage échoue dans la re-création authentique des états affectifs et des images mentales, tout comme le mécanisme syntaxique trahit la démarche logique véritable de l'esprit.

Le langage brut, non transfiguré par l'opération de magie poétique à laquelle préside la conscience des analogies universelles, ou purifié à l'usage de la science par la rigueur mathématique, n'offre qu'un à peu près inepte des événements intérieurs. D'où l'échec à la fois du naturalisme poétique, et de la vieille rhétorique à recettes. D'où, faut-il ajouter, la caducité du principe surréaliste.

Le sens des mots souffre d'une indétermination due à sa double nature: il est à la fois pensée et langage. Profitant de cette équivoque, les nominalistes et leurs alliés surréalistes tentent de tirer à eux tout le jeu. Dans le second *Manifeste* Breton caractérise ainsi l'inspiration:

Nous la reconnaissons sans peine à cette prise de possession totale de notre esprit, qui, de loin en loin, empêche que tout problème posé, nous soyons le jouet d'une solution rationnelle plutôt que d'une autre solution rationnelle, à cette sorte de court-circuit qu'elle provoque entre une idée donnée et sa répondante (écrite par exemple). . . . Le court-circuit se produit quand les deux "pôles" de la machine se trouvent réunis par un conducteur de résis-

¹² Victor Hugo, *Dernière Gerbe*, in *Œuvres Complètes* (Paris: Albin Michel, 1941), xxiv, 326.

¹³ Charles Serrus, *La Langue, le sens, et la pensée* (Paris: PUF, 1941), pp. 168-169.

tance nulle ou trop faible. En poésie, en peinture, le surréalisme a fait l'impossible pour multiplier ces courts-circuits. . . .¹⁴

Les surréalistes substituent à la tension bipolaire qui s'établit entre la pensée et le langage un centre de force unique, véritable rocher miraculeux dans le désert spirituel, qu'il suffirait de frapper pour faire jaillir en flots de paroles les eaux vives de l'esprit.

L'origine probable du nominalisme de Breton est à trouver chez Rimbaud, et, dans la lignée des grands philosophes du XIX^e siècle, chez Hegel. Rimbaud exprime dans ses lettres comme dans ses œuvres poétiques l'ambition de recréer le monde par l'invention d'un nouveau langage. Mais il échoue dans cette tâche titanesque. Lui qui s'était cru mage ou prophète, il est "rendu au sol, avec un devoir à chercher, et la réalité rugueuse à êtreindre. Paysan!"¹⁵ Ce retour brutal au réalisme, ce rejet du nominalisme démiurgique et prométhéen expliquent les sentiments ambivalents qu'entretiennent les surréalistes à l'égard de Rimbaud, qui fut à la fois précurseur et renégat de leur mouvement.

Dans ses *Recherches sur la nature et les fonctions du langage* Brice Parain étudie la position de la philosophie moniste allemande par rapport au langage. Il définit cette philosophie comme la "cosmologie du nominalisme."¹⁶ Analysant l'expressionnisme hégélien, il nous livre le secret de ce monisme:

Toute la philosophie de Hegel est construite sur ce postulat: images et mots forment ensemble le tout de notre conscience et se combattent à l'intérieur de ce tout, qui tantôt, ainsi, paraît se détruire et tantôt se reconstituer, pour de nouveau se détruire, puis se reconstituer sans fin.¹⁷

Brice Parain conclut en rejetant la conception hégélienne et ses conséquences, qui demeurent incertaines du fait que nous ne connaissons pas l'origine du langage sur laquelle s'appuie le postulat et dont procède la dialectique des images et des mots.

Le sens du discours est la résultante d'un couple de forces qui, prises isolément, s'avèrent inaptes à traduire la vie de l'esprit. L'intention poétique est d'abord une impulsion informe, un cri de l'être vers l'être dont l'écho se perd dans la sombre et sonore citerne de l'âme.

¹⁴ *Second Manifeste du surréalisme*, p. 54.

¹⁵ Arthur Rimbaud, *Une Saison en enfer*, *Œuvres* (Paris: Mercure de France, 1937).

¹⁶ Brice Parain, *Recherches sur la nature et les fonctions du langage* (Paris: NRF, 1942), p. 144.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 159.

Le mécanisme verbal, trop rigide, paraît à première vue peu propice à l'expression des affections ou à la création imaginative, qui sont l'apanage unique de l'individu. La pensée explore les ressources dont dispose le langage, elle tente de deviner quelles créatures neuves sauraient en surgir pour répondre à sa détresse. Dans ce but elle le transforme et se l'approprie, après l'avoir soumis à une critique qui, bien plus que l'automatisme, constitue la clef de l'invention poétique.

Le "fonctionnement réel de la pensée" ne s'accomplit pas dans les mots, mais avant eux, dans leur direction, et se complète enfin par leur intermédiaire. La nuance est considérable. La durée intérieure ne se tisse dans aucun langage acquis. Tout au plus peut-elle s'y réfléchir, après s'être propagée dans les profondeurs du corps qui est son premier organe expressif.

Ce n'est pas en vain que Thomas Hobbes se défiait de "la traduction du discours de l'esprit dans le discours de la langue et des erreurs qui en résultent."¹⁸ L'esprit se vit d'autant moins par l'intermédiaire des mots que l'attitude mentale est plus proche de la transe contemplative, de l'épreuve du surréel—c'est-à-dire d'une réalité concentrée et parvenue à son point extrême d'acuité émotive! Bergson, dans la quatrième partie de l'*Evolution Créatrice*, met à sa place véritable le langage muet que toute parole proférée est impuissante à traduire. Mallarmé, dans ses poèmes-miroirs, tenta de réverbérer ce soleil noir de l'âme, cette parole tacite, faite d'absence au monde dont le souvenir, de Nerval à Giraudoux et à Maurice Blanchot, n'a cessé de hanter notre littérature. La poésie, en ce qu'elle a d'essentiel, est cette intention de la pensée silencieuse vers le langage impossible—un drame de l'incarnation.

A l'autre extrême de la vie mentale le calcul, langage-type, ne peut se dispenser de la propriété d'unités mobiles, substituables sans résidu (Valéry), que confèrent les mots à certaines conceptions abstraites. Selon le dogme surréaliste, le relâchement de l'attention permettrait aux mots de "se faire jour à travers nous." On peut se demander dès lors ce qui nous est le plus étranger, le moins authentique au niveau de l'âme profonde,—le langage acquis entaché d'impersonnalité, ou nous-mêmes saisis dans "notre plus grande intimité," liés à cette expérience centrale de l'esprit dont Valéry disait: "C'est ma vie même qui s'étonne."

Si notre être crée un obstacle aux mots, c'est que les éléments du

¹⁸ Thomas Hobbes, *Treatise on Human Nature*, V.

langage lui sont à l'origine extérieurs, non pas confondus d'emblée avec notre vie cachée, qui reste toujours celle de l'origine. Elle ne possède pourtant d'autre instrument pour se manifester clairement. C'est là sa tragédie, et la gloire du poète. L'intimité spirituelle n'est pas visitée par la lumière déformante de la conscience pratique: le langage appauvri qui lui sert d'organe ose à peine l'effleurer. L'art seul sait poser un masque de quartz translucide sur le visage fuyant des eaux souterraines.

Brandeis University

CLAUDE VIGEE

REVIEWS

Cynewulf, *Elene*, ed. P. O. E. Gradon (London: Methuen, 1958. x + 114 pp.). DUE to necessary but unfortunate limitations of space, Dr. Gradon has not been able to provide us with a definitive edition of the *Elene*. The Latin text has not been reprinted with Cynewulf's; patristic echoes have not been elucidated; theme, structure, symbolism and prosody have not been discussed. Nevertheless, this little volume does what it sets out to do: it presents a generally sound text of the poem, together with a surprising amount of useful information about the MS, the analogues, the language and the date of the poem. The introduction, where most of this information appears, is a model of clarity and compactness; indeed, its scant 23 pages have the specific density of some Cynewulfian studies three or four times that length. Particularly interesting are the editor's discussion of the discovery and early study of the Vercelli codex, her comments on the runic epilogue and, above all, her straightforward presentation of the dialect features of the text. This compact body of introductory material, the illuminating textual notes, the bibliography and the comprehensive glossary reveal both a sound knowledge of Cynewulf and excellent scholarly judgment. All in all, then, this is a welcome addition to the Methuen series.

A high point of the volume is the sanity displayed by the editor in her handling of the text itself. Wherever possible, she has attempted to defend the MS reading, but her conservatism is tempered by both common sense and imagination. Particularly pleasing is her reten-

tion of *leodhwata lindgeborga*, l. 11; *boldes brytta*, l. 162; *sigores tacne*, l. 184; *helm*, l. 230; *pære*, l. 293; *gifeð* l. 360 *gehwær*, l. 548; *godgimmas*, l. 1113; and *þan næglan*, l. 1127. To this list may be added *wigan*, l. 937, although the editor's defense of the form is not particularly convincing. Also sound are her rejection of the conjectural *to* before *deape*, l. 302, and of *on* before *tweon*, l. 668; in the latter instance, however, I see no reason to suppose that 7 represents the preposition, a possibility suggested in the note. There are also a few particularly pleasing emendations, e. g., *besettan*, l. 1025, and probably *wendo*, l. 348 (cp. *hafu*, l. 807, and the dialect discussion, p. 13). The addition of *fæder min* before *eaforan*, l. 439, seems to me a particularly fine suggestion, one which deserves to be widely accepted by future editors.

Still, while I find that my own textual interpretations generally harmonize with Dr. Gradon's, I nevertheless feel that her text could be improved in a number of instances. Leaving aside a few cruxes demanding detailed analysis, I will mention only a few improvements of a relatively simple nature: in l. 311, resolve 7 as the expected *ond* (cp. the note in Krapp's *Vercelli Book* edition of the poem); in ll. 370-71, add *dryhtna* before *dryhten* and arrange these lines as in Krapp's text (the omission was probably due to haplography; cp. the Gradon reconstruction of l. 439); in l. 380, retain *alesen* (cp. Krapp's note); in l. 477, retain *hie*; in l. 487b, rearrange the wording to *ond þegnum his* (Kenneth Brooks' excellent suggestion; see the Gradon note); in l. 636, retain *feale* as a late form of *feala* (see Gradon's discussion of the language of the text, p. 10); in l. 755, emend *he sceal to hie sculon* (Cynewulf would hardly have made the confusing shift to the singular here); in l. 861, emend *hwylcre* to *hwylcne*; in l. 957, emend *oferswiðende* to *oferswiðedne*; in l. 1134, emend to *wuldre* (or *wuldres*) *wæs*, which is more appropriate than *wuldre is* (cp. 1129b-31a); in l. 1180, emend *ymb* to a word of similar appearance (*sinc*, suggested in the Gradon note, seems satisfactory). As in the case of the last reading, an appreciable number of the above suggestions are mentioned in Dr. Gradon's own notes. In some instances, she seems on the verge of emendation, hesitating only because she does not wish to tamper with the MS text. Thus, the chief strength of her editorial work becomes the source of occasional weakness.

There are also a few miscellaneous shortcomings to be observed in the text. As a service to the reader, the lection numbers omitted by the scribe might well have been added editorially before l. 1 (I),

l. 894 (XI), and l. 967 (XII). Of a decidedly more serious nature are the following printing errors which I have noticed in the text: *sæmearh plægean* (for MS *sæmearh plegean*), l. 245; *caseras* (for MS *caseres*), l. 262; *ga* (for MS *þa*), l. 417; *pidda* (for MS *gidda*), l. 418. Further, the quotation begun in l. 621a is not closed at the end of l. 626b. In the note on the text, p. 24, it is not recorded that *g* with tilde abbreviates *ge* in l. 841, and it is erroneously stated that *see* with tilde abbreviates *sanctus* in l. 504, rather than true MS *scs* with tilde; as well, 7 abbreviates the first syllable of *andsware* in l. 455, not l. 456.

In her record of MS corrections and other irregularities, Dr. Gradon is the first editor of the *Elene* since Benjamin Thorpe to make substantive use of Maier's excellent transcript; she is also the first editor since Wülker to examine the *Vercelli Book* text in the original. Unfortunately, though, her scribal record is incomplete, and in many instances does not coincide with my own MS notes taken at Vercelli in 1953-54. To supply the missing data and to note conflicting interpretations would require more space than is warranted here. However, my readings will be incorporated in the apparatus of my collective edition of Cynewulf's signed poems which is currently in progress. I will note here only a very few readings which, for one reason or another, are of particular interest. Line 204: all of *garþrist* except *t* and possibly part of *s* is on an erasure which brings about one half letter to the left of the present *g*; the first erased letter was itself *g*; Dr. Gradon's note may be a misprint. Line 482: *d* in *rodera* corrected from *ð*; if the occasional crossing of *d* or the failure to cross *ð* can be taken as a sign of Mercian confusion of these two letters, this instance may be added to those cited by the editor, p. 12; however, I am skeptical of such dialect evidence. Line 734: the editor says that *mægen þrymme* was added above probably by a later hand; in my opinion, the *Vercelli Book* scribe himself probably made this insertion. Line 935: *a* in *Halig* apparently altered by erasure from *æ*; compare the correction of *famige* to *famige* in l. 237; these changes are almost certainly dialect revisions. Line 1149: I am not perfectly certain, but I believe that the scribe wrote *reordode* and then cleverly corrected this to *weorda*; the original reading was a curious, but quite meaningless blunder. Line 1257: the first *s* of *cnyssed* has been cancelled by points above and below; the point above is slightly blotted on the right side but seems to have been intentionally made; the point below is certainly intentional; we should read *cnyssed*.

here. Most of the other addenda which I have gathered is, to be sure, minutia, and its absence will scarcely bother most users of the Gradon edition; yet much of it throws light upon the strengths and weaknesses of the *Vercelli Book* copyist, the *Elene's* most important "editor."

Turning to other aspects of Dr. Gradon's edition, I am pleased to note that the MS accents are printed in the texts just as they should be, and that they are accurately reported in general. However, according to my own inspection of the codex, the marks above *feore*, l. 134; *galgan*, l. 719; and *ymb*, l. 1063, are not accents, although Dr. Gradon interprets them as such. Moreover, she fails to record the accents above *of*, l. 761, and *ful*, l. 768; the shaft of the former is faint but certain. The accent above *For* in l. 27 may exist, but did not seem certain to my eye; if there is an accent here, the ink may have been accidentally smeared. I did not note an accent over *rihta*, l. 909, but I did record one over *mod*, l. 989. In each of these instances, Dr. Gradon disagrees; of the latter she notes: "the mark is apparently the tail of the letter above." The resolution of these slight conflicts must be left to some later observer; still, an inspection of these two words in photographic reproduction has not changed my views.

A few inaccuracies in the introduction deserve notice. The first complete edition of the *Vercelli Book* poetry was Kemble's, not Grein's as stated on p. 8. Zupitza's 1877 edition of *Elene* was not based upon Knöll's collation, which was simply appended to the introduction after the text had been prepared (Gradon, pp. 8-9). The editor comments (p. 1, n. 2) that "The letters *Pa?*, read by Maier in [*Fates of the Apostles*] line 100, appear to be the *ær* of *mæran* on the other side." But I assume that the supposed *P* is the runic *W*, a reading supported by Napier. In the light of this independent testimony, *W* may surely be accepted. Maier's *a*, on the other hand, is dubious and may have arisen through some kind of optical treachery. For a lengthy discussion, see my comments in *JEGP*, LVI, 576-78. An adequate discussion of the dialect material gathered and evaluated in the introduction would require an article-length study. Suffice to say here that the editor's dating of the poet (first half of the ninth century) is quite satisfactory, but that her localization of Cynewulf in West Mercia is much less certain. I do, of course, agree that our poet came from Mercia, but I feel that the "Western" evidence is generally too ambiguous to inspire much confidence. Do we sufficiently understand

the OE dialects to lend authority to such a theory? I for one doubt that we do.

In the selective bibliography, there is a generous listing of scholarly works, but two which are conspicuous in their absence are the editions of *Elene* by Charles W. Kent (1889; 2nd ed., 1903) and Sergio Lupi (1951). Also worthy of inclusion are two studies by the editor herself: "Constantine and the Barbarians," *MLR*, XLII, 161-78, and "Cynewulf's *Elene* and Old English Prosody," *English and Germanic Studies*, II, 10-19. G. Storm's valuable article on the spelling of the poet's name (*English Studies*, XXXVII, 104-10) probably appeared too late for consideration.

Such shortcomings as I have noted seem insignificant indeed beside the chief strength of this edition; Dr. Gradon has made the *Elene* available to contemporary students in a very useful little volume. I hope that many of them will find Cynewulf's poem as memorable as I have found it, and that a few at least will study it as profitably as Dr. Gradon has done.

University of Illinois

L. A. MUINZER

Richmond P. Bond, ed., *New Letters to the Tatler and Spectator* (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1959. xii + 232 pp. \$5.00). AS employed by Steele and Addison the letter to the editor was a major component of the essay journal, hundreds of such letters appearing in the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*. The "new" ones in Professor Bond's book are a sheaf of ninety-six (seventy to the *Tatler* and twenty-six to the *Spectator*), which the editors received and kept but, at least in their present form, did not use. Most of them are signed with initials or pseudonyms, and all are addressed impersonally to Isaac Bickerstaff or to Mr. Spectator and sent in care of the publisher. They are now printed for the first time from the original manuscripts preserved in two collections. Eighty-five addressed to the *Tatler* and the *Spectator* of 1711-12 are in the Marlborough Collection of Steele papers at Blenheim Palace. Eleven sent to the *Spectator* of 1714 are in the Richard E. Tickell Collection, there presumably for the reason that they were received during the editorship of Thomas Tickell. We have only recently become aware of the Tickell letters; but the existence of those in the Marlborough Collection has long been known about, and indeed several, not included here, were printed by Aitken

in his edition of the *Spectator* (1898). Of late years scholars privileged to examine the Steele papers have fingered this bundle of letters cursorily, but Mr. Bond had the imagination to recognize their value and the enterprise to transcribe and study them. His book is in effect Volume III of the unpublished letters. In 1725 a two-volume work containing almost three hundred of them—*Original and Genuine Letters Sent to the Tatler and Spectator*—was brought out by Charles Lillie with a foreword by Steele, who evidently had made them available, and a dedication to him. But the scrutiny which those in this present book have had Lillie never would have dreamed of.

Of great variety in authorship, contents, length, style, and tone, they are worth reading simply as a reflection of the temper and the "compositional manners" of the Augustan letter-writer. Mr. Bond, however, had other reasons for his minute examination of their handwriting, postmarks, addresses, endorsements and scribbled memoranda and for his close reading of their contents in search of specific references to *Tatler* and *Spectator* papers. His attention is directed to the identification of correspondents, establishing of dates, and assignment of authorship with the thought of helping to solve these and similar problems in the periodicals themselves. Not the least of his purposes is to find an answer to the query: What light do these letters throw on editorial techniques of using ideas and "hints" and of revising work done by another pen?

He finds abundant evidence that, though denied a public appearance in their original form, quite a number were regarded by the editors as useful ore. For example he demonstrates that Letters 1, 38, and 51 contain ideas which were more or less closely woven into *Tatler* papers Nos. 57, 122, and 138 respectively and that Letter 56 was made the starting point of *Tatler* No. 180, a paper-length essay by Steele. Several letters were converted into entire *Spectator* papers. We see that Letter 96 by Henry Grove (signed) was subjected to numerous editorial emendations before it became *Spectator* No. 635. *Spectator* No. 520, long ascribed to John Fransham of Norwich, turns out to be the transformation of his short signed letter (76), containing only the germinal idea, expanded by Steele into a letter-essay. The manuscript of unsigned Letter 73 in the Marlborough Collection, received by Mr. Spectator and endorsed "follow nature," brings up a question in the assignment of authorship. It was used after revision as *Spectator* No. 404 (a Z paper), which has been variously ascribed to Hughes, Budgell, and Pope. But, according to Mr. Bond, the

manuscript is not in the hand of any of them. Was the basic letter written by a regular assistant or a volunteer? Which of the editors by adding, subtracting, and re-phrasing—while retaining the progression of thought—made of *Spectator* No. 404 a pointed, shapely essay-paper? Certainly someone had to make another copy for the printer.

In particular two points made in the Introduction are fresh and enlightening: the wide range of uses to the public, the editors, and the periodicals which the letter to the editor served, and—amply documented—the thoughtful awareness of the editors themselves that in collaborating with their correspondents they were adapting a journalistic device to a literary end. The notes to each letter give information as to its date and authorship; specific reference, if needed, to related papers; and when borrowings from it are involved, an analysis made with Mr. Bond's enviable knowledge of the *Tatler* and the *Spectator*. Speaking only for myself, occasionally I should have welcomed a more discursive note, violating the rule of brevity and complete relevance; for example, the evidence for naming Richard Nutt as printer of the *Tatler*, instead of John. One error should be noted: Daniel Purcell, the musician who set the songs in Steele's early plays, is wrongly annotated (p. 98 and note). The difficult task of editing ninety-six letters of multiple origin is accomplished expertly without great ado but with fairness alike to the eighteenth-century writers and to twentieth-century readers.

Professor Bond has given us still another helpful book, a model in its techniques and findings, which will be indispensable to students of the eighteenth-century periodical.

Goucher College

RAE BLANCHARD

Thomas W. Copeland, ed., *The Correspondence of Edmund Burke*. Vol. I, April 1744–June 1768 (Chicago: The Univ. of Chicago Press, 1958. xxvi + 377 pp. \$8.00). IN 1948 the private papers of the Fitzwilliam family were removed (by the truck load) from the family mansion of Wentworth Woodhouse in Yorkshire to the Sheffield City Library. This was a notable event in English historical scholarship. The Fitzwilliams were Leviathans among the landed families of Yorkshire, indeed among the landed families of England. They owned large estates in Ireland and in the Midlands as well as in Yorkshire, and traced their history back to the ill-fated Earl of Strafford. Their

papers were bound to throw new light on many subjects in local and national history—not least of which was the career of Edmund Burke, intimate and colleague of the fourth Earl Fitzwilliam to whom was left the trusteeship of Burke's literary remains.

Shortly before Wentworth Woodhouse disgorged its manuscripts, another Fitzwilliam house—Milton near Peterborough—had shown the way. This extensive collection also contained numerous Burke letters, nearly as important as those from Wentworth Woodhouse. The Milton MSS. were removed to the Northamptonshire Record Office, originally at Lamport Hall in that county, now at Delapre Abbey. It thus became possible to undertake an edition of Burke's letters which might satisfy the standards of modern scholarship. Professor Copeland's is the first volume of such an edition; nine more are planned to follow (one of which will be an index), under the direction of a distinguished committee of which Professor Copeland is the chairman.

If this first volume is any indication of what is to come, the new edition will be much superior to the old, a four-volume *Correspondence of Edmund Burke* which appeared in 1844 and was edited by the fifth Earl Fitzwilliam and Sir Richard Bourke. Of 197 Burke letters in the first volume of the new edition, only 27 were printed in the 1844 edition—although many had appeared elsewhere, sometimes in such curious places as a work on *Two Centuries of Ceramic Art in Bristol*. The new edition also includes such letters to Burke as are necessary to an understanding of his own. The annotation of the entire correspondence is thoroughly commendable, being neither oppressive nor misleading. For the political notes Professor Copeland (who is not a professional historian) has been assisted by Mr. John Brooke, the historian of the Chatham administration, without whom (Professor Copeland graciously acknowledges) "the volume could not have been completed at all."

If we are to understand Burke's complex personality, we must go to his letters for possible enlightenment. There we may hope to find some revelation of those fierce undercurrents of passion which Mr. G. M. Young (in his British Academy lecture of 1943) touched on so suggestively. In this connection the first 60 letters of the new edition—the letters of Burke's undergraduate days at Trinity College, Dublin, from April 1744 to January 1748—are disappointing. They are dull, commonplace, even ill-written. Professor Copeland is himself compelled to observe that Burke "very often sat down to write

when he had very little to say." The subsequent letters, however, are more rewarding.

When Burke chose the public career of a member of parliament at the age of thirty-seven, he chose a career which in eighteenth-century England was likely to be precarious and anxious. He was after all an outsider—an impecunious, half-Catholic Irishman, the son of a Dublin attorney—and, as Mr. G. M. Young has said, an elderly outsider at that. The nearly inevitable consequences of insecurity and anxiety seem to have left their marks. Are we mistaken in seeing them in the correspondence prompted by Burke's falling-out with his first patron, W. G. Hamilton, early in 1765? If, as it seems likely, this rupture was the result of a genuine misunderstanding, Burke's reaction was exorbitant. He turned on Hamilton with furious indignation, denouncing him to one friend "as an infamous scoundrel" (p. 196), and to another as the thief of "six of the best years of my life. . . . In that time he made his own fortune (a very great one), and he has also taken to *himself* the very little one, which I had made" (p. 200). Presumably the "very little one" was the pension Hamilton had obtained for Burke on the Irish Establishment. The truth of the matter, however, was not that Hamilton had taken it for himself, but that at Burke's own suggestion he had had it transferred to someone else.

Was there a streak of persecution mania here? And do we see it again later in one of the last letters in the volume—one which Professor Copeland chooses to single out in his introduction as an oddity? It is a letter to Burke's close friend, Charles O'Hara, written in 1767 (pp. 339-340), two years after Burke's entrance into parliament, during which time (as the world thought) he had achieved a rapid and brilliant success in the House of Commons.

Everybody congratulated me on coming into the House of Commons, as being in the certain Road of a great and speedy fortune; and when I began to be heard with some little attention, every one of my friends was sanguine. But in truth I was never so myself. I came into Parliament not at all as a place of preferment, but of refuge; I was pushed into it; and I must have been a Member, and that too with some Eclat, or be a little worse than nothing; Such were the attempts made to ruin me when I first began to meddle in Business.

The Johns Hopkins University

DAVID SPRING

Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, *Paul et Virginie*, ed. Pierre Trahard (Paris: Garnier, 1958. clxxiii + 321 pp., 5 plates. Classiques Garnier).

IN keeping with the high standards of the revitalized Classiques Garnier, Pierre Trahard has given us a most serviceable edition of that persistent eighteenth-century classic, *Paul et Virginie*. The text has been carefully reestablished, in the final authorized form of the 1806 edition. The variants in the several editions published during Bernardin's lifetime are listed, though they are admittedly trivial. However, there remains a manuscript which is, on the contrary, extremely revealing. It is not complete, nor is it the final manuscript from which the first edition was printed, but represents an intermediary state. For this reason it is all the more illuminating, and the numerous *ratures* and *surcharges* are testimony to Bernardin's painful and clumsy struggles to formulate his thoughts. Trahard devotes eighty pages to a description of the manuscript and to an extensive reproduction of its most interesting parts. Page references to the published text, which may be completed by reference to the section of variants, make it possible to get an unusual view of the author at work, and of the transformations his novel underwent in a laborious process of composition and revision. The editor supplies other useful information: extracts from contemporary reviews and private comments; bibliographies of principal editions and translations, of theatrical adaptations, of critical writings. To complete the *cadre*, he gives us the "Avis" to the first edition (1788) and the long "Préambule" to the 1806 subscription quarto edition. These rarely reprinted documents cast little light on the novel, but much on its author. His vanity and pettiness form a strange *mélange* with providentialist moralizing and infatuation with fantastic scientific theories (notably his theory on the formation of the earth and his "disproof" of Newton's theory of gravitation).

An important feature of this edition is, of course, Trahard's fifty-page introduction. Charmingly written and containing much useful information, it is in some respects unsatisfying. He gives us a sensible account of the origins and sources of the novel, in literature and in life, including a summary of what others have considered to be its sources. The reactions of contemporaries, of which we are treated to a good sampling, reveal how *Paul et Virginie* responded to the tastes and needs of a generation, and not merely to those of a class. Trahard also follows, at considerable length, the varying opinions of

later novelists and critics, down to the present, thus giving us an *aperçu* of the later history of the work.

All of this is good, and useful. But what one would have most expected to find in such a lengthy introduction, an analysis of the aesthetic values and weaknesses of the novel, and of its ideological assumptions and implications, is strangely wanting, limited, for the former, to little more than two pages of banalities (which could be found in any manual of French literature), and for the latter, to brief, stray comments. He notes Bernardin's moralizing purpose, and the contrapuntal place of *Paul et Virginie* in relation to the line of licentious novels which are a characteristic—but a more profoundly significant characteristic than he apparently realizes—of the eighteenth century. Here we must look beyond the conscious intent to the basic concepts of man and of love: eroticism and seduction were symptoms and expressions of a break-down of traditional values and a growing intuition of what we have come to call "the absurd." Bernardin's relation to Rousseau is mentioned, but not analyzed. Instead of the surprising statement that Rousseau wanted to establish equality (p. viii), the reader would like to know, for instance, how the disciple's picture of man in nature is like or unlike the master's, and the place of providentialism in each. (The flaws in Bernardin's providentialism are not noted.) Trahard observes that Virginie's fatal gesture of modesty contradicts nature and the natural instincts which are so dear to her creator. He complains that Bernardin violates nature and turns it awry into moral paths. In phrases like these, he blithely skirts one of the complex problems of eighteenth-century thought: that of the concept of nature and of its relation to morality. It would also have been useful to say something about religion; and about the combination of providentialism and primitivism which has become tinged with darker hues of pessimism. The best of all possible worlds is certainly not a good one, in Bernardin. But much more could be said about the ambiguity of optimism and pessimism in this work. For a deeper and more refined aesthetic study of *Paul et Virginie*, Trahard might have gone to Jean Fabre's important article, "Une Question de terminologie littéraire: *Paul et Virginie*, pastorale," which is not even mentioned in the bibliography, although it was published in 1953. His introduction is the weaker for this omission. He might not, for one thing, have confused the tragic with the pathetic (p. xxv).

Goucher College

LESTER G. CROCKER

Gustave de Beaumont, *Marie or Slavery in the United States, a Novel of Jacksonian America*, trans. Barbara Chapman, introd. Alvis L. Tinnin (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1958. xx + 252 pp. \$4.95). IT is a remarkable book that Miss Chapman and the Stanford Press have made available for the first time to the English-speaking world. Students of French will also be grateful to them, for, as Mr. Tinnin reminds us in a concise and informative introduction, Beaumont's novel has not been reprinted in France since the forties of last century.

Tocqueville's travel companion and friend chose to publish his observations on the United States in the form of a novel. One might be predisposed to think that this was not a good idea, the more so as Beaumont has little to add to what Tocqueville tells us in the *Démocratie*. Even the sources and anecdotes of both writers are the same. Yet *Marie* is not a pale shadow of the *Démocratie*, and Tocqueville was being more than merely kind when he recommended the work of his friend to his own readers.

It was the color problem that particularly interested Beaumont, and not primarily the problem of the slave in the South, but the problem of the free colored citizen in a democratic society. It is not only his tragically prophetic analysis of this problem that distinguishes Beaumont's book, however, it is his passionate sympathy with the victims of prejudice and of human, as distinct from legal, injustice. Like Tocqueville, Beaumont diagnoses, but he does not stop there. Through the mouth of his hero, Ludovic, he accuses; and *Marie* is the work of a moralist as well as of a student of customs and manners. Where Tocqueville has all the reticence of the positive scientist, Beaumont's choice of the novel form allowed him to transcend analysis and to voice the indignation of the moral human being.

There is truly, as Mr. Tinnin points out, something of the romanticism of Madame de Staël and of Chateaubriand in *Marie*. But there is nothing merely conventional about the frustrated idealism of Beaumont's hero or the tragic destiny of his heroine. If *Marie* does not live to become the wife of the white man she loves, this is because her deepest desires cannot in reality be fulfilled. In making his hero respect the virtue of the woman he loves, Beaumont was not straining at pathetic effects in the manner of *Paul et Virginie*. Chastity as such is not the highest ideal of *Marie*. On the contrary, it is precisely because a sexual relation between Ludovic and *Marie* would have been allowed by society that the lovers refuse it, for it is their human

aspirations that are thwarted, not their appetites, and it is their right to love each other as human beings that they are fighting for. When Ludovic on his side chooses to withdraw from the society of his fellow men, this is not because of any mysterious maladjustment to a dull, self-seeking world, but because his humanity cannot be satisfied in it. "The chief source of all my errors," he confesses at the end of the book, "was my belief that man is greater than he is. If man could comprehend the generality of things, could rally all human activity round a single principle, and establish on earth, by an act of his will, the empire of justice and reason, he would be God, no longer man."

Beaumont describes Ludovic's idealism as an error. The paths that lead to justice are many and they are humble, Ludovic admits at the end of his story. But although the less ambitious characters (Nelson and the Catholic priest) achieve more than he does in concrete results, the rightness of his aspirations is never in doubt, and, like a beacon, lights up those humbler paths. Beaumont the social scientist felt bound to recognize the practical uselessness of revolting against society, but in his artist's imagination the ethical passion of his hero is justified.

The translator has tried to capture and sustain the somewhat rhetorical flavor of the original, but this is a difficult tightrope to walk in English and she is more successful in the discursive than in the descriptive passages of the book.

The Johns Hopkins University

LIONEL GOSSMAN

Jean Pommier, *L'Invention et l'écriture dans La Torpille d'Honoré de Balzac* (Geneva: Droz, and Paris: Minard, 1957. 248 pp. Société de Publications Romanes et Françaises, 60). JE doute que personne, se voulût-il balzacien intrépide, digère sans peine aucune cet ouvrage extraordinairement copieux. Le texte du manuscrit de *La Torpille* y occupe vingt-cinq pages environ (imprimées, il est vrai, en petits caractères); et les gloses du savant commentateur revendent tout le reste, trop riche et trop substantifique moelle pour ne pas risquer de rebuter les estomacs délicats.

Une élémentaire sagesse,—mais qui n'est peut-être pas de mise, ainsi que je dirai plus loin,—semblerait recommander qu'on divisât cette imposante "somme" en ses parties constituantes, chacune répondant aux besoins et dilections d'une certaine catégorie de connaisseurs.

La première partie, relative aux "problèmes de création," a de quoi amplement intéresser l'esthéticien: j'entends par là, faute d'un meilleur mot, celui qui suit du plus près possible, sous l'aspect de l'imitation ou de l'invention proprement dite, la genèse des oeuvres d'art. Au reste, lorsque le forgeron s'appelle Balzac, peu importe, bien au fond, s'il tire d'autrui ou de lui-même les matériaux qu'il jette et amalgame au feu de sa forge. C'est donc pour la clarté de l'exposition, et pour elle seule, que M. Pommier distingue entre l'étude des sources et celle des apports personnels, l'essentiel étant, dans les deux cas, de saisir à leur formation, "quand ils se dessinent et se colorent, les premiers linéaments des intrigues et des caractères." Les premiers, oui certes,—et les derniers tout aussi bien, pour autant que rien s'achève dans la production balzacienne, éternellement refaite et continuée. Rappelons, à ce propos, que "la Torpille" est l'éloquent sobriquet par où les admirateurs d'Esther, petite-nièce du papa Gobseck, désignent cette fille de maison close; que le fragment auquel elle prête son "nom," récit de ses amours régénératrices (mais contrariées) avec Lucien de Rubempré, a paru isolément en 1838 et deviendra par la suite le prologue d'une oeuvre beaucoup plus vaste (*Splendeurs et misères des courtisanes*, 1844); que cet épisode s'inscrit logiquement, dans l'ordre de l'action comme dans celui de la publication, après les *Illusions perdues* de 1837; qu'il traite, en revanche, d'événements postérieurs à ceux qui nous sont contés dans *Un grand Homme de province à Paris* (1839). Au surplus,—et je passe sur bien des complications accessoires,—*La Torpille* marque la rentrée en scène de Vautrin, *alias* Carlos Herrera, que l'on n'avait pas revu depuis *Le Père Goriot* (1835) et dont la carrière intermédiaire, pour une bonne part, demeure provisoirement dans la pénombre. Belle occasion, en vérité, d'étudier, dans ses bonds imprévus, dans ses retours en arrière, dans ses incohérences pour tout dire, le prétendu "système" des personnages reparaissants! Ne vous plaignez pas, glisse quelque part Balzac en guise de justification, d'apprendre "le milieu d'une vie avant son commencement, le commencement après sa fin": ainsi, neuf fois sur dix, dans la réalité quotidienne, se révèle à nous l'existence d'autrui. Ce qu'il se garde d'ajouter, ce que démontre jusqu'à l'évidence la laborieuse expertise de M. Pommier, c'est que pareille procédure, chez lui, reflète davantage encore les heurts de composition de la *Comédie humaine*: heurts dont les circonstances sont largement responsables, mais aussi, ne l'oublions pas, la fougue et le désordre naturels de son génie.

Cela est si vrai que la "bataille des épreuves," telle que Balzac la livre interminablement et sans jamais la gagner tout à fait, tient en grande partie à la nécessité d'améliorer les raccords plutôt précaires que le premier jet établissait entre les diverses tranches de la vie des personnages. La dite bataille requiert l'attention de M. Pommier dans la deuxième section de son ouvrage; et, ici, l'opiniâtreté du chercheur est aidée par la chance qui veut qu'au manuscrit de *La Torpille* (volume A 222 de la collection Lovenjoul) soient annexés les placards et épreuves en pages qui ont servi pour l'édition originale. Il faut même croire que Dame Fortune a un faible spécial pour les balzacien, puisque certain folio qui manquait à Chantilly a été inopinément retrouvé au Musée Paul-Arbaud d'Aix-en-Provence. Toujours est-il que nous avons là une étude extrêmement poussée de ce que j'appellerai les variantes de fond (retouches apportées aux effets d'ensemble, recherche de la plausibilité), par opposition aux variantes de forme qui font l'objet des troisième et quatrième parties. L'histoire littéraire peut certes tirer profit de ces longs développements, mais c'est une histoire littéraire déjà *technique* en ses principaux aspects, telle que la pratiquent une ou deux fois en leur vie, et sur des textes-specimens, les adeptes de l'édition critique.

Enfin, quand M. Pommier s'attaque au "travail du style dans les éditions," il emprunte résolument leurs outils aux spécialistes de ce genre de recherches. C'est à eux que je laisserai le soin d'apprécier dans ce domaine (grammaire, syntaxe, enchaînement des phrases, etc.), le détail et la portée de ses trouvailles. Je préfère, pour ma part, noter au passage la conclusion générale, c'est-à-dire littéraire encore, qui se dégage de ce foisonnement d'exemples. Conclusion qui, somme toute, me paraît rejoindre celle où arrivait Stefan Zweig par des voies évidemment beaucoup plus intuitives: et c'est à savoir, que Balzac n'est pas un styliste, mais, chose bien différente, un forçat du style, condamné à payer, dans son âge mûr, de peines et de scrupules inégalement récompensés, l'insouciance de sa jeunesse—l'irresponsabilité artistique de Lord R'hoone et d'Horace de Saint-Aubin.

S'il est exact que les grandes divisions de l'ouvrage de M. Pommier semblent ressortir à des disciplines distinctes, le moins que l'on puisse affirmer est que l'auteur déploie une égale compétence en chacune d'elles. Encore ce compliment, qui n'est pas mince, ne suffit-il point. Il serait même, je crois, de nature à fausser notre jugement final. M. Pommier, à vrai dire, s'offre pour tout le contraire d'un Maître

Jacques aux tabliers divers et nourrit ouvertement l'ambition de tenter une "nouvelle approche." Ce qu'il entend par là, je n'ai pas le loisir d'en dissenter dans un modeste compte-rendu; mais l'on en concevra quelque idée si l'on veut bien se reporter, comme j'ai eu la curiosité de faire, au texte imprimé de la leçon d'ouverture qu'il prononça, voilà treize ans, pour ses débuts au Collège de France. Il y succédait à Paul Valéry, dans la chaire de *Poétique* rebaptisée, à son intention, chaire d'*Histoire des créations littéraires*. Succession spirituelle jusqu'à un certain point: l'influence valéryenne (sans parler de l'influence bergsonienne) transparaît nettement tout au long du programme que se traçait le nouveau professeur. Nébuleuse primitive successivement cristallisée, la création se prolonge, prend forme et figure par le travers et le moyen des résistances que lui oppose le langage. *L'invention* et *l'écriture* sont tout au plus les moments d'un même élan que le critique digne de ce nom se doit, non de briser, mais bel et bien de suivre en sa parabole. Il y faut, déclarait M. Pommier, "un esprit de ferveur, et presque de piété." Or, cette ferveur, cette piété se combinent ici avec le culte de Balzac, transformant en une moisson homogène, en une offrande quasi rituelle, l'austère entassement des fiches: "Notre récolte,—est-il dit en conclusion,—nous la tendons à Balzac, pour qu'il relève la tête et que ses yeux se réjouissent."

Columbia University

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

Honoré de Balzac, *Splendeurs et misères des courtisanes*, ed., Antoine Adam (Paris: Garnier, 1958. xxix + 754 pp.). THE Garnier publishing house has streamlined its well-known Classiques series with this and other Balzac titles formerly edited by Maurice Allem. A jacket covers the familiar yellow paperback which is offered now with a neat trim edge: no more page cutting necessary, a welcome change. Sixteen plates on orange colored paper and two on white illustrate the book. These are reproductions either of the Marescq and Havard edition illustrations or of contemporary engravings from the Cabinet des Estampes of the Bibliothèque Nationale. We should have preferred these plates to appear facing the pages of the passage they illustrate, but this presentation would probably have involved too great an expense for this type of edition.

In his *Introduction* Professor Adam recalls the long and complicated history of the publication of the book, or rather its meta-

morphosis from the original *La Torpille* to its final title. Lovenjoul's *Histoire des oeuvres de H. de Balzac* has furnished Professor Adam with the framework of this history to which he has added many details mostly obtained from manuscripts of the Lovenjoul collection. More original are the editor's attempts to find the written sources of the society Balzac analyzes, i.e. the demimonde, "lorettes" and prostitutes as well as the intricacies of judicial procedure and police methods. Professor Adam states that Balzac's documents of these milieus were largely obtained from books, and only occasionally from conversations with people in a position to be well informed, such as Vidocq, Benjamin Appert, etc. . . . It remains to be seen whether Balzac did not have more firsthand information about this seamy side of Parisian life. Although the editor is ready to accept Léon Gozlan's statement that Balzac drew his inspiration for the Mme de Sérigny episode from the actual case of a "Comtesse de B***," he fails to mention Charles Léger's account of the scandal caused by the suicide of Lucien de Rubempré, which everybody thought to be an allusion to Delphine de Girardin's young lover Duranton who met a similar end.

In editing the text Professor Adam has departed from Maurice Allem. Footnotes appear at the bottom of each page, while variants are grouped in a appendix at the end of the text. The variants show an extremely conscientious editing and should be a great help to the balzacian scholars who wish to study the development of the text to its final form. More important is the division of the text into chapters according to the original publication. It accentuates the serial effect of the work and emphasizes what Balzac said about it: "Je fais de l'Eugène Sue tout pur." In this respect the book has a more immediate appeal, what Professor Adam calls "une utilité évidente" for the reader. However since Balzac did not insist on keeping the chapter divisions in the last edition of the work published in his lifetime, such a return to the original division was not in our opinion justified.

Professor Adam's footnotes are always carefully documented and more numerous than those published by Marcel Bouteron in the Conard edition of Balzac's complete works. In some instances Adam completes Bouteron, as p. 7 n. 1, p. 111 n. 1, more often corrects it as p. 23 n. 1, p. 72, p. 187, p. 496, p. 502, p. 595, p. 616, p. 636. One reference (p. 395) to Balzac's *Correspondance* edited by J. Ducourneau is incorrect. Sometimes Professor Adam goes to great length in his notes, as on p. 122, also p. 249 where he states that

Robert d'Arbrissel fut le fondateur de l'abbaye de Fontevrault. . . . Il enseignait particulièrement la chasteté, et pour vaincre la chair, il partageait le lit des religieuses. Il se glorifiait des victoires qu'en cette situation il remportait sur le démon.

If he seems well informed, is it because (to parody the line) "nourri dans le sérail, il en connaît l'histoire"?

To Appendix I are relegated the Preface to the Potter edition and the dedication, probably because they are interesting now only to the scholar. It is true the Preface is outdated, but the dedication should have been left at the beginning, since Balzac had kept it in the Furne edition. A short draft of the beginning of the last part is added, perhaps to include what to my knowledge is a heretofore unpublished ms connected with the work, but it offers little of value.

Appendix II is more informative. It contains mostly the variants. Professor Adam has based his text on the *Furne corrigé* which had already been used by the Bouteron editions (Conard and Pléiade) for the first three parts, and the Chlendowski edition for the last. Altogether nine editions, all published in Balzac's lifetime, as well as the original ms provide the variants.

A list of characters that appear in other parts of the *Comédie humaine* follows, with very sketchy biographies. Lastly the bibliography lists mainly books to be consulted with regard to the world of prostitution, police and prisons in Balzac's time. Publishing dates of certain items show a discrepancy with those mentioned in the Introduction, which furthermore contains a few titles not listed in the bibliography.

I have noticed a few broken types: pp. 30, 153, 206, 221, 236, and one misprint: p. 721 *Robespierre* should read *Roberspierre*.

University of Chicago

MAURICE LECUYER

Roger Shattuck, *The Banquet Years* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1958. 306 pp. \$8.50). *THE Banquet Years* opens on a truly magnificent and incredibly absurd photograph of one of those mammoth banquets of pre-war years which gave Mr. Shattuck's book its felicitous title. In itself, it is a fitting introduction into "la belle époque," those years which Mr. Shattuck so vividly evokes. The book fulfils the promise of this beginning. Unquestionably it sets a stan-

dard, proposes a method and opens up a rich field of investigation. Written with apparent ease, it can be read with pleasure and profit by the non-specialist. Nowhere do the author's erudition, his special theories, or his personality intrude. Mr. Shattuck feels no need to coin an abstruse vocabulary nor to distribute blame or praise as too many critics seem to think it is their task to do. Yet a real and broad scholarship underlies the book, and a very distinct personal point of view evidenced in the pleasant, measured, modest and understanding approach. Mr. Shattuck is not afraid to re-create the concrete flesh and blood aspects of the figures and the period he has chosen. He does not despise anecdote, but he never allows anecdote to become detached from its human sources, nor from the whole development of a period or an individual life. In this connection, his introductory pages are a little misleading, a little too obviously picturesque, a little too strenuously "sensational." But this is a very minor flaw.

That the 20th century began in the '80's has now become a generally accepted truism in the history of French literature and art, though some scholars prefer a later date, the great creative years of the decade immediately preceding World War I. Mr. Shattuck starts from 1885, the year of Hugo's funeral. "The twentieth century could not wait fifteen years for a round number; it was born, yelling, in 1885" (p. 4). But, in fact, he demonstrates rather that the century had to wait another twenty years before it came into its own, so far as the arts are concerned.

In order to bring out more clearly the peculiarly "modern" characteristics of contemporary art as it emerges from the receding nineteenth century, Mr. Shattuck has chosen to present the lives, the ideas and the works of four figures representative of the "avant-garde," all four connected in some way, though not always directly: the painter Rousseau, known, erroneously as Mr. Shattuck points out, as "le douanier"; Erik Satie, the composer; Alfred Jarry, writer and symbolic figure; Apollinaire, the poet and "impresario" of the period. And indeed it is Apollinaire who is the link between the men in this "singular team." That other, representative figures could be chosen Mr. Shattuck readily admits, suggesting other combinations. He also points to the dangers as well as the advantages of moving toward a period through a choice of "representative men." "Only by cutting below the most prominent figures is one likely to find men both representative of the era and significant in their own right. Their

artistic identities are most discernible against their background rather than removed from it into a new context of individual greatness" (p. 25). This in fact justifies the choice and the method which is reminiscent of Rousseau's "portrait-paysage."

Mr. Shattuck divides his book into three parts. In the first two chapters, "Turn of a Century," he brushes a vivid over-all picture of "la belle époque" and presents his four representative men, each of whom exemplifies one of the new directions taken by the arts in "the banquet years": the "child-like vision" of Rousseau; Satie's transformation of the comic into "the absurd"; with Jarry, "the eruption of dream into waking experience"; Apollinaire's systematic use of "ambiguity." All these in Mr. Shattuck's words reveal an identical attempt to free art from the logic of "traditional discourse." These are familiar traits of modern art and Mr. Shattuck's contribution is to show them emerging from the very person and mode of life of his four artists and to analyze their translation into techniques through specific paintings, compositions, attitudes, and poems.

The second part, the bulk of the book, entitled *Rejuvenation* deals with the four men, successively and very thoroughly for in no sense does Mr. Shattuck reduce their complex personalities to fit neatly into an abstract scheme. Mr. Shattuck devotes two long chapters to each man, one biographical, the other a presentation, analysis, and evaluation of their artistic experiments and achievements.

The third part entitled "The Century Turned" synthesizes the preceding analyses and considerably enlarges the perspective to include more broadly the whole field of modern art. That the "Banquet Years" came to end in 1914 is more than clear. What Mr. Shattuck wishes to prove is that in their apparent frivolity and heedless extravagance they coined all the values the next half-century was to exploit. The description of the essential quality of the art evolved as "an art of stillness" may surprise many a student of modern art. But the thoughtful pages that end the book are convincing and bear much meditation.

In the over-all development there are some slips, factual for the most part, and in the last paragraph of p. 276 one comes across a garbled sentence, no doubt due to an error in printing. But these will most certainly be corrected in a second edition of the text. Mr. Shattuck's method is very closely related to his analysis of what characterizes modern art, the eruption of "reality" into art, the "juxtaposition" of elements, of separate parts to evoke "unity at a moment of time."

It is particularly rich when used by a critic who seems to be completely at home in all the arts.

New York University and Wellesley College

GERMAINE BRÉE

Marcel Proust, *On Art and Literature 1896-1919*, trans. Sylvia Townsend Warner (New York: Meridian Books, Inc., 1958. 416 pp). THE publication in English of this recently discovered material (brought out in France by Gallimard in 1954 under the title *Contre Sainte-Beuve, suivi de Nouveaux Mélanges*) is a welcome event, both to Proustians and to students of contemporary literature in general. The student of Proust who has no access to the French originals now has before him a good cross section of Proust's critical writing; and with the recently reprinted essays on Ruskin, Baudelaire, and Flaubert in *Pleasures and Days* (Anchor, 1957), the American reader now has the bulk of Proust's criticism at his disposal. Miss Sylvia Townsend Warner's translation of the *Contre Sainte-Beuve* volume is in all respects excellent.

It has become increasingly evident that Proust is an important critic and deserves a place in the configuration of critics between Taine and T. S. Eliot. In many ways he helps to prepare the terrain for Eliot and the New Criticism by fighting his own battle against the biographical and psychological approach to criticism represented by Sainte-Beuve. Against the "materialistic" fallacies of Sainte-Beuve and Taine, he espouses an approach that focuses exclusively on the text, in an attempt to find evidence in it of the patterns of the spiritual life of a writer. The result is certainly not the formalistic criticism elaborated by the New Critics, but something between, say, Sainte-Beuve and John Crowe Ransom. The basis for this attitude in Proust's case lies in his conviction that the material self of the artist is not the same as his spiritual self: the spiritual (the real) self is constantly attempting to transcend the limitations of the contingent self. It is easy to see that this notion is completely integrated with the fundamental principles of Proust's aesthetics (as summarized at the end of *A la Recherche du temps perdu*), both in theory and in practice. Criticism, thus, serves the function of the mediator between the two selves; it is a lever for the spiritual life. The books that Proust loved were for him so many Virgils leading him out of his dark wood of confusion; and criticism was the means whereby this

self-liberation was achieved. For Proust, criticism was an absolute necessity, not simply a luxury or a pastime.

Obviously, an attitude of this kind has its limitations. The criticism that poets practice is always interesting in relation to their own creative activity; a writer's critical judgment usually teaches us more about the writer himself than about the subject of his discussion. Only a few poets, such as Baudelaire and T. S. Eliot, have given us criticism that would be great (i. e., creative) even if their poems did not exist. Proust is not quite in this category; we are constantly aware of what the criticism was doing for *him*, how in the case of his Pastiches, it "purged" him of obsessive influences, and how, in other instances, it helped him to clarify his own aesthetic problems and to find his own way. Nonetheless, almost every one of the essays contains wonderful insights that have the power to stimulate even the reader who has never looked into *A la Recherche du temps perdu*. For it has become clear, now that virtually all of Proust's work has been unearthed, that everything points toward the great novel, and that after the writing of *Les Plaisirs et les jours* Proust never ceased to be preoccupied with the problems of the work-in-progress. To use the charming set of distinctions made by Mr. Isaiah Berlin in his *The Hedgehog and the Fox*—Proust was a hedgehog par excellence. Everything after 1896 was directed toward the attainment of his single-minded goal: to write the novel that was within him in the only way that such a work could be written. In brief, Proust between 1896 and 1909 (the probable inception of the novel) was "à la recherche d'un style et d'une forme." The steps in this quest were 1) the abortive novel *Jean Santeuil*, prefiguring much of the content of *A la Recherche*; 2) the Ruskin translations and much preoccupation with Ruskinian aesthetics; 3) the cathartic activity of pastiche-writing; and 4) the *Contre Sainte-Beuve* experiment; the final challenge of Sainte-Beuve's "wrong" method, and an attempt to set things right. In this work Proust seems definitely to have found his way, and we are not surprised at the hasty and inconclusive ending: *Du Côté de chez Swann* already looms on Proust's literary horizon. Thus we see that for Proust criticism is not the companion of creation, as it is for Baudelaire, but its handmaiden.

The *Contre Sainte-Beuve* is as unclassifiable as it is fascinating. It begins with an abbreviated version of Proust's aesthetics; the first six chapters are early drafts of sections of *A la Recherche*; the next five contain the Sainte-Beuve materials. Here Proust is writing

something that might be termed a set of narrated literary essays (he is explaining to "maman" the fallacies of Sainte-Beuve's method) primarily centered around Nerval, Baudelaire, and Balzac, whom Sainte-Beuve either failed to judge, or misjudged. At the end of this sequence something very characteristically Proustian happens: the narrator prolongs the Balzacian characters, projecting them into his own universe (this by way of indirect criticism of Balzac), and the world of the *Guermantes* is born. The final chapters continue the fiction, and only in the conclusion is there a somewhat hasty return to the subject matter of the Preface. What we have actually witnessed is the metamorphosis of the critic into the novelist.

The other essays contained in *On Art and Literature*, with very few exceptions, fall into this transitional period 1896-1909 and afford us a fine glimpse into the workshop of Proust's mind. The most valuable of these, for the student of literature, are the notes on Goethe, Stendhal, Eliot, Tolstoy and Dostoevski. It is regrettable that these sketches are all too brief. Much of this material was used in *A la Recherche*, particularly in the *phrases-types* passage of *La Prisonnière*. Of the remaining drafts, most of them of minor interest, the finest and the most illuminating is the one of "The Artist in Contemplation" (pp. 307-13).

The five essays on painters—Watteau, Chardin, Rembrandt, Gustave Moreau, and Monet—are particularly welcome additions to the body of Proust's criticism. Every one of these essays, no matter how fragmentary, is superb and reveals not only Proust's sensibility but also something genuine about the painter's work. One is tempted to quote from these writings at length. Let one quotation from the Chardin essay suffice, in which Proust touches on the function and limitation of criticism with respect to the work of art—an attitude that his own criticism embodies:

As for Chardin, I have shown what the work of a great artist could mean to us by showing all that it meant to him. Since it was in no way a parading of out-of-way qualities, but the expression of what had lain nearest to him in his life and of what lies deepest in things, it is our life that it appeals to, it is our life that it makes contact with, and gradually disposes towards things, and acclimates to the heart of things . . . Acts of creation . . . proceed not from a knowledge of their laws but from an incomprehensible and obscure capacity which is not made any the stronger by enlightenment.

Emory University

WALTER A. STRAUSS

Michael F. Moloney, *François Mauriac: A Critical Study* (Denver: Alan Swallow, 1958. 208 pp. \$3.75). IN this essay on Mauriac, Mr. Moloney aimed "(1) to identify the masters, ideological and artistic, upon whom Mauriac most largely drew; (2) to show that the metaphysic of love which animates all of Mauriac's fiction gives to his characters in love unique subtlety and profundity; (3) to dispose of the myth of Mauriac's pessimism."

No one will be surprised to find, in the chapters devoted to the first objective, the names of Pascal, Racine, Maurice de Guérin, Dostoevsky, and Proust. Monsieur Mauriac has, in one place or another, accorded each of them a prominent role in his spiritual and esthetic development. (He lays claim also to Balzac and Baudelaire.) Mr. Moloney has quoted and paraphrased these statements and attempted to find critical justification for them. This last is an enterprise that could not, by its very nature, be more than moderately successful, since it involves a rather difficult distinction between influences upon Mauriac's general conceptions of the condition and destiny of man and influences upon his practice of the literary arts. Pascal was certainly a great event in Mauriac's life, but unhappily that does not mean that Mauriac was able to appropriate his refreshing worldliness, his persuasive rationality, or his epigram. On the other hand, one hears in his prose reiterated echoes of the tongue of Bossuet; so much so in fact that it seems reasonable to say that his style is constructed upon Bossuet's rhythms and vocabulary.

Mr. Moloney has dealt sufficiently well with the subject of influences, both general and literary. The chapter (entitled "The Lessons of the Masters") in which he estimates the Racinian tenor of Mauriac's fiction is the best in his book.

The "metaphysic of love" and his own "pessimism" are again subjects suggested by Monsieur Mauriac himself in his personal essays. He has dubbed himself "a metaphysician working in concreteness" and has explained his fiction as "the struggle waged between Nature and Grace within the human heart." He wrote *Bonheur du chrétien* and *Dieu et Mammon* to prove that the pessimism of *Souffrances du pécheur* (where he had simply tried to show, he later said, "that the Christian religion was at once true and impracticable") was the product of a momentary access of despair.

Yes, the biographer, looking at the man and at his whole career, can "dispose of the myth of his pessimism." But what interest can the critic have in doing so when it is precisely that mood of radical

despair that breathes out of the magnificent stories that Mauriac published from 1922 to 1928; those stories in which he composed of scene and image and situation such a gut-twisting, throat-constricting vision of human incapacity for joy and fatal devotion to the impossible as we are not likely soon to see again? It does not much matter whether Mauriac is a pessimist or not. He has little gift for theory, and his work will probably never produce any revolution of ideas in individuals or groups. On the other hand, he did at one time possess the power to work conversions of feeling. Perceived through the magic of his sensibilities, the world not only became other than it had been, it developed the sort of equilibrium of contraries (the commonplace and the unbelievable, the familiar and the dreadful, the vital and the moribund) that is revealed only in works of art of the first order.

The demon who whispered the secrets of creation in Mauriac's ear was late in coming. The books that appeared during the first ten years of his career are too full of uncertain longing and impotent protest to bear more than a superficial family resemblance to those that started appearing in 1922. Some of the features are the same, but the sinews are lacking. After the crisis of self-examination in 1928 (of which we find a sort of running record in *La Vie de Jean Racine*, *Souffrances et bonheur du chrétien*, and *Dieu et Mammon*) he began to ignore the counsel of his demon and to try, with little inspiration, to correct the image of the human condition contained in *Le Baiser au lépreux*, *Genitrix*, *Le Désert de l'amour*, *Thérèse Desqueyroux*, and *Destins* by substituting for it an edifying vision of timid but deserving victims of life's trials, of repentant rogues, and of others who overcome their native wickedness and find peace with their fellow men. From then on the organic unity of Mauriac's fiction is in dissolution: his sensibilities and his intentions are working at cross-purposes. *Le Naud de vipères* (1932) is the only book published after 1928 that obeys the rigorous demands of the earlier idea. Its reversal in tone is reserved to the very last pages where, mixed with age and approaching death, it seems more a legitimate relaxation of tension than a contrived transformation.

(It is, incidentally, one of the weakest features of Mr. Moloney's essay that he makes no overt effort to discriminate between excellence and mediocrity in Mauriac's fiction. *La Fin de la nuit* is treated as though it were a part of, and on a par with, *Thérèse Desqueyroux*, and *Le Mystère Frontenac*, *Les Anges noirs*, and *Les Chemins de la*

mer are so often referred to that one might assume that they represent the novelist's best achievements.)

Upon what then is that vision based which transfigures the commonplace world of human reality and impresses its own creation with the stamp of incontestable rightness? Is it upon the "metaphysic of love"? This phrase, so suggestive in itself, is an interpretation which is already remote from the scenes of the novels. It is the result of an effort to abstract from them some statement that will have meaning in a context other than the one they provide. Like all interpretations, it is born of the reality under consideration. It reflects something of that reality, but it does not account for it. The "metaphysic of love" does not produce "subtlety and profundity," or anything else, in the characters. It is rather because Mauriac represents the human situation in uncommon and perplexing terms that an interpretation of it is demanded.

This is not the place for a lengthy exposition, but I might suggest in bare terms that the system of distortions—of "optical errors"—that determines Mauriac's art is constructed of an adroit and fortunate conjugation of individual physio-psychological traits and traditional esthetic principles. Native *morbidity*, *hyperesthesia*, *perversity*, and *contrariety* are sharpened into instruments of creative vision and are then enriched by the studied effects of *caricature* and *ambiguity*. Mauriac's creation, like any other, is a product of theory and temperament.

In spite of his long and active literary career (it began in 1909), his election to the French Academy more than twenty-five years ago, and his Nobel Prize (1952), François Mauriac is still perhaps the most misestimated of major twentieth-century novelists. His work has not won the sort of intelligent and passionate scrutiny accorded to that of his fellow Nobel laureates, André Gide and Albert Camus. Proust, Malraux, Sartre, even Duhamel and Jules Romains, have established a more vital relationship with their contemporaries.

The reserve, or aloofness, with which his work is treated has resulted in no small measure from Mauriac's identification with orthodox Catholicism—an identification that he, for reasons of his own, accepted and tried to deepen. It began with Charles Du Bos' essay (1933) praising the evidences of his "conversion" in *Ce qui était perdu* and *Le Nœud de vipères* and has continued sporadically ever since. It is Mauriac's Catholicism that is discussed, not his artistry. He is offered to the public as something little better than a propagandist.

Mr. Moloney has not openly elaborated upon this image. His study is scholarly in its method and it aims to be critical. But his predilection for the mother-figures, his apparent preference for the novels of the 'thirties (*Le Mystère Frontenac*, *Les Anges noirs*, *La fin de la nuit*, *Les Chemins de la mer*), his belief in "the metaphysics of love," his revelation of the novelist's "dark compassion" for his characters, his wish "to dispose of the myth of Mauriac's pessimism" all add up to more of the same—delicate and indirect additions to the portrait of "the Catholic novelist," all reasonably justified by the texts adduced and the point of view applied to them.

And yet when was Mauriac more genuinely religious than when he was engaged in a truly dreadful combat with his own orthodoxy, in that moment of which he wrote after it had passed: "A man may be the prisoner of a metaphysics with which he is, body and mind, in disagreement"? For it was then that through an inspiration (illumination? hallucination?) of the sort that is always the condition of artistic creation, he discovered the emblems, the *other* faces, in which his own dilemma could somehow be figured and let them loose in their headlong, destructive rush toward truth and liberation.

Art is fundamentally unorthodox; it is necessarily a distortion of the world; it is always shocking. These are the perspectives in which any work of art needs to be viewed, and no work appeals more eloquently for such interpretation than Mauriac's.

Duke University

THOMAS CORDLE

Lewis W. Spitz, *Conrad Celtis: The German Arch-Humanist* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1957. x + 142 pp. \$3.25). NEW studies and interpretations of important figures in cultural history are always welcome. Professor Spitz' study of Conrad Celtis (1459-1508) is the first extensive biographical treatment in English of one of the outstanding figures in German humanism. Celtis is one of that group of scholar-poets in pre-Reformation Germany in whom one can plainly and with great advantage follow the organic forces within, and yet at times outside of, the intellectual circles that were to contribute so significantly to the northern Renaissance and to the literature of Germany in the sixteenth century.

Celtis was crowned first German poet laureate by the Holy Roman Emperor Frederick III and has been the subject of many studies.

It was a century ago that David Friedrich Strauss dubbed him the German arch-humanist. Since then his importance, primarily as poet and playwright, in the Latin literature of pre-Reformation Germany has become increasingly enhanced, and thanks to the work of Professor Spitz we now have available a compact presentation of Celtis the man as well as Celtis the author.

The present study, viewed in the scope of its announced contents, attempts a great deal. One gets the impression that Spitz has the material, and certainly the ability, to flesh out many of his chapters. In a printed text of 117 pages in eleven chapters, wherein three of the chapters are devoted to Celtis as playwright, poet, and philosopher, the impression on students of Renaissance and Reformation literature will probably be that editorial and printing limitations must have been imposed on the author. The first ten chapters contain slightly over 100 pages, as if the design were purposeful that the ten chapters should average ten pages each; they are frequently exactly ten pages. It is impossible, of course, for a reviewer to declare the proper "weight" distribution for any work, but it must be noted that chapters on Celtis as playwright and poet must certainly have been conceived as much more demanding, and therefore more extensive, than, for example, chapters on Celtis and the Rhenish Sodality or Celtis and the Danubian Sodality. In fairness to the author, however, it should also be noted that he is a student and teacher of European history and not a literary historian.

In spite of this brevity and imbalance the volume would be a pleasant and informative excursion for the interested reader were it not for several editorial lapses and an annoying method of either omitting notes on the sources and quotations or of so compounding the notes that the reader is left confused. Perhaps the most serious error is that which involves one of Celtis' more notable accomplishments, his "borrowing" and the subsequent publication of the Roswitha von Gandersheim manuscript. On page 42, Spitz says Celtis "... made no copy, but wrote his corrections into the text, added his observations, and a table of contents and turned it finally in 1501 to a printer where it picked up a few additional ink smudges and thumb prints. He had very little antiquarian reverence or even practical caution about him." Yet, on page 68, Spitz says of Celtis: "In not a single work which he edited did Celtis make any textual emendations, improvements or correction. Critical scholarship was not his forte." Of less import is such a lapse as (p. 60): "... Jakob

Locher, Philomusus, called a similar group after himself, the *Philomusea Sodalitas*. Wimpfeling called into being the *Strassburg Literary Sodality*." The italicized title in English makes itself remarkable. Such a lapse as the latter is forgiven when the reader is compensated with a comprehensive index and an excellent bibliographical essay which precedes the nine pages of notes and handily summarizes the status of Conrad Celtis studies.

The last two chapters in the volume, Celtis as patriot and as philosopher, are very informative and the best contributions by Professor Spitz to Celtis studies. Where Spitz has turned to philosophical interpretation and historical analysis of Celtis the humanistic thinker, he has rendered not only valuable insights into the deeds and thoughts of a man in an era but also clarified and defined much that needed publication. Two earlier chapters, on the Rhenish and Danubian sodalities, are also excellent presentations which aid in pointing up those activities of Celtis which have been ignored or scantily treated by literary historians. In these last mentioned four chapters, and indeed in all the others, the author has fulfilled the hope he expressed in his foreword "that Celtis will here emerge from the shrouds of time and documentary Latinity with some measure of that vitality which characterized his personality and colorful career."

University of California, Los Angeles

ELI SOBEL

Peter F. Ganz, *Der Einfluss des Englischen auf den deutschen Wortschatz 1640-1815* (Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag, 1957. 257 pp.).

THIS study of Germany's word-debt to England is a welcome contribution to the history of international cultural exchange, and as such will be welcomed not only by the linguist, but also by the researcher in literary and cultural history, since the borrowing of a word usually represents the borrowing of an idea or a product, and thus its importance is more than a linguistic one. The 165 years which Professor Ganz covers in this study were apparently a period of great activity between England and Germany, and the author presents us with a large body of material and interesting generalizations.

The first ten pages of the book are a concise introduction to the problems faced by the researcher in word-borrowings, followed by a fifteen-page general survey of English influences in Germany during this period, indicating the cities and the areas of intellectual and

commercial activity which fostered word-borrowing. The body of the book is the dictionary, comprising more than 500 main entries, each consisting of a brief summary of the word's history in England (usually from the NED), then its development in German, supported with quotations from German sources illustrating its use (often into the 20th century). Words now obsolete are starred. The author has made his work more valuable by including loan translations and native words which have taken on new meanings under the influence of their English counterparts. Such borrowings are the most difficult to recognize, and the author has performed a service by not neglecting such phenomena.

This reviewer finds very little in the work to criticize, but the following points might be mentioned. Although such a study can never be complete, many of the words could have been better documented from the sources. In his introduction the author criticizes R. B. Stiven for including in her study of the same subject words "die wohl nur in Wörterbüchern ihr schattenhaftes Dasein fristeten." Professor Ganz himself, however, includes many words from dictionaries with only a single quoted occurrence, and other words which are used only once by a single author and never reach the dictionaries. Whether these are examples of such "shadowy" words or merely examples of incomplete documentation is not always clear. For other words, however, which certainly led long and healthy lives in German, we must also make do with only two or three quoted occurrences; e. g., "Robinsonade," "Bowle."

The date of the earliest occurrence of a word is difficult to establish with certainty because of the ever-present possibility that an earlier occurrence will come to light. Such is the case with "Sir," which Professor Ganz quotes first in 1772, but which had already been used by Lessing in *Miß Sara Sampson* in 1755. The oversight is surprising, since the author quotes from this play to illustrate several other words. This is the only date which the reviewer has found to be incorrect, but other words which I suspect might turn up in earlier works are "Travestie" (1802), "Charakteristik" (1772), "utopisch" (1774), for example. An occasional miss is inevitable in a study of this type, however, and only indicates that research on such a topic can never be considered finished.

There are a few typographical and bibliographical errors, both in the text and in the fourteen-page bibliography of sources: the dates

of Harsdörffer's *Frauenzimmer Gesprächspiele* (p. 241) and of Eschenburg's *Britisches Museum* (p. 17) are incorrect; Palmer's *Neuweltwörter* (p. 256) appeared in 1939, not 1933; the title of Zieglschmid's article is quoted incorrectly (p. 257); in the two occurrences of the title of Pope's *περὶ βάθους* (p. 16 and p. 37) there are a total of seven typographical errors.

The Johns Hopkins University

RICHARD PACKHAM

Claus Victor Bock, *Quirinus Kuhlmann als Dichter* (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1957. 133 pp. *Basler Studien zur deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 18). THE strange, fanatic figure of Quirin Kuhlmann, one of the most bizarre phenomena of the German Baroque, has attracted in recent years rather unusual attention. The investigations of Robert L. Beare¹ have resulted not only in a more complete and accurate bibliography and the rediscovery of a lost initial work of the mystic, but they have also provided a firmer basis for the psychological investigations which now appear so necessary for a better understanding of his obscure and recondite works. Add to these the unprinted dissertation of Rolf Flechsig (*Quirinus Kuhlmann und sein Kuhlpsalter*, Bonn, 1952) and individual specialized studies, such as that of Käthe Estrich (*Studien zur geistlichen Lyrik Quirin Kuhlmanns*, diss., Greifswald, 1929), and it may be seen that the time is now ripe for a thorough and detailed evaluation of Kuhlmann's place in the development of poetic mysticism in German Baroque literature. Unfortunately, Bock's book is only a *Vorstudie* for such an attempt.

Quirinus Kuhlmann als Dichter, quite obviously a dissertation in slightly revised form, essays an interpretative biography of Kuhlmann in Part I, and the twofold typological analysis, principally under the influence of Muschg, of the poet and his language in the two chapters of Part II. Part I, which is primarily dependent on the numerous autobiographical statements appearing in Kuhlmann's works, proceeds through twelve chapters, of which each represents a phase or turning point in Kuhlmann's development. Discussion of

¹ Robert L. Beare, "Quirinus Kuhlmann: The Religious Apprenticeship," *PMLA*, LXVIII (September 1953), 828-862; "Quirinus Kuhlmann. Ein bibliographischer Versuch," *La Nouvelle Clío*, VI (March-April 1954), 164-182; and, "Quirinus Kuhlmann and the Fruchtbringende Gesellschaft," *JEGPh*, LII (July 1953), 346-371.

the works themselves or interpretations of Kuhlmann's religious philosophy or mysticism are strictly subsidiary to the reconstruction of the facts of the poet's life as they are to be derived from the often obscure and nebulous references appearing in the works. The result is a revealing picture and represents the most accurate and understanding analytic biography to date. Particularly cogent are the two chapters "Tanneke and Magdalena," dealing with Kuhlmann's peculiar relationship with these two strange women, and "Die türkische Reise," in which the theme of "die ekstatische Wanderschaft," which forms a basis for a part of the interpretation of Part II, is established and the effects of Kuhlmann's failure in Turkey are analysed. On the other hand, the two weakest chapters are the Jena chapter, in which Kuhlmann's student period is presented in a somewhat false perspective, due to the fact that certain biographical materials² were not available at the time of the appearance of this study; and, the final chapter "Moskau," describing Kuhlmann's tragic death. This final chapter omits mentioning even the cause of Kuhlmann's execution and is too much concerned with the lurid details of the burning in a so-called "schwarze Stube." In addition, the important period 1682-1688, which witnessed the publication of the essential parts of the *Kühlpsalter* as well as several other important works, is casually dismissed in a single page. Other omissions in Part I are Kuhlmann's relationship with Ahasverus Fritsch as well as with Athanasius Kircher. A more thorough interpretative analysis of the various radical changes which Kuhlmann passed through during his life, such as the change from poet to religious mystic via Jacob Böhme, would also be a welcome aid to the understanding of his development. All in all, however, the present biographical treatment is the most thorough, accurate and perceptive attempt to date. The details are corroborated and variant or contradictory information is well sifted and evaluated. This in itself makes the book a valuable contribution to our biographical picture of this poet.

Most frustrating and tantalizing are the many instances throughout Part I, when Bock cites or refers to particularly puzzling passages of Kuhlmann's works without attempting to interpret, or without citing the full passage or the circumstances to which it refers. In view of the rarity of the *Kühlpsalter* and of other important works

² Cf. my article: "Quirin Kuhlmann: The Jena Years," *MLN*, LXXII (December 1957), 605-610.

of Kuhlmann, which will scarcely be available to the reader of this study, such casual treatment is indeed irritating.

In Part II, chapter one is concerned with the development of the picture of Kuhlmann as an ecstatic. Bock accepts Muschg's archetypal presentation of shamanism, and, departing from this viewpoint, proceeds typologically to depict Kuhlmann with regard to this archetype. The result is a stimulating and convincing interpretation which could be very valuable in our understanding of Kuhlmann's ecstatic poetry, even if we do not accept the here axiomatic validity of Muschg's standpoint. This theory is especially valuable for our interpretation of the various "Geistreisen" which are sometimes central in Kuhlmann's mysticism. The chapter concludes with a comparison of a Kuhlmann adaptation from Juan de la Cruz with its original and adds considerably to a schematic interpretation of Kuhlmann's formalistic method.

The second chapter of Part II, "Der Ekstatiker und die Sprache," is a rather disorganized attempt at analysis of Kuhlmann's language. It leads to no significant results. A casual discussion of Kuhlmann's *Spieltrieb* suggests a valuable comparison with Harsdörffer from this point of view. Particularly lacking is any attempt on Bock's part to see Kuhlmann within the framework of the German Baroque. Indeed, many features of the mystic's style, which are viewed by Bock as especially typical of Kuhlmann, are indeed typical of the Baroque as a whole. I speak, for example, of Bock's statement: ". . . der Dichter [wiederholt] seine eigene Formgebung und [verfällt] darüber ins Formelhafte . . ." (p. 98), or his ignoring of such essential features of Baroque style as the tendency to word-redundancy or the predilection for puns and word games with semi-serious interpretative intent. It is interesting to note that Bock claims of Kuhlmann's later poems: "Auffallend ist . . . die neu auftretende *Reimlosigkeit*. Sie ist nicht so sehr ein Zeichen grösserer dichterischer Freiheit als der abnehmenden Konzentration und Verdichtungskraft." Whereas, von Faber du Faur, whose poetic judgment has seldom been questioned, maintains: ". . . und schliesslich trägt ihn in den letzten Büchern des *Kühlpsalters* der Schwung der Ekstase in reimlose Rhythmen voller Weihe und Spannung."³

The work, as a whole, shows too many traces of the dissertation.

³ Curt von Faber du Faur, "Die Keimzelle des *Kühlpsalters*," *JEGPh*, XLVI (1947), p. 158.

It is vastly overfootnoted (527 footnotes to 100 pages of text), and, since the footnotes are given at the back of the book, it necessitates frequent thumbing back and forth, only to find the source for a Kuhlmann quotation or an exasperating "ebenda." This information could just as easily be given in parentheses in the text itself. Many of the footnotes are entirely unnecessary for a published work. In the final analysis, however, this book will be of great utility, both as a clear and reliable guide to the events of Kuhlmann's life and as a source of inspiration for future interpretations of Kuhlmann's mysticism.

University of California, Berkeley

BLAKE LEE SPAHR

Christel Matthias Schröder, *Die "Bremer Beiträge." Vorgeschichte und Geschichte einer deutschen Zeitschrift des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Bremen: Carl Schünemann Verlag, 1956. 312 pp.).

THIS monograph is the first to be written on one of the more renowned journals of eighteenth-century German literature. The intention of the author is to fill the gap by presenting the origin, the history, and the particular intellectual climate which produced the *Bremer Beiträge*; this, however, not so much from a literary point of view but rather "unter zeitschriftenkundlichen Gesichtspunkten."

Mr. Schröder begins his study with a critical survey of previous scholarly works and references to the *Bremer Beiträge* (e.g. those of Josef Körner, Wilhelm Kosch, Wolfdietrich Rasch *et al*). Here the author exposes for us the frequent omissions, discrepancies, and the usual copying from second hand material. Special praise, however, is attributed to Franz Muncker's edition of vols. 43 and 44 of Kürschner's collection *Deutsche National-Literatur* as well as to Muncker's introduction to these volumes, which Mr. Schröder considers the qualitatively most essential contribution to the appreciation of this journal and its contributors.

The second section of this study deals with the "*Vorgeschichte der Bremer Beiträge*." The development of the journal, which originally appeared under the title *Neue Beyträge zum Vergnügen des Verstandes und Witzes*, is given within the framework of a general survey characterising the development in the field of German journals beginning with Christian Thomasius' *Schertz- und ernsthafte, vernünftige und einfältige Gedanken* . . . in 1668, the first journal in German,

of Kuhlmann, which will scarcely be available to the reader of this study, such casual treatment is indeed irritating.

In Part II, chapter one is concerned with the development of the picture of Kuhlmann as an ecstatic. Bock accepts Muschg's archetypal presentation of shamanism, and, departing from this viewpoint, proceeds typologically to depict Kuhlmann with regard to this archetype. The result is a stimulating and convincing interpretation which could be very valuable in our understanding of Kuhlmann's ecstatic poetry, even if we do not accept the here axiomatic validity of Muschg's standpoint. This theory is especially valuable for our interpretation of the various "Geistreisen" which are sometimes central in Kuhlmann's mysticism. The chapter concludes with a comparison of a Kuhlmann adaptation from Juan de la Cruz with its original and adds considerably to a schematic interpretation of Kuhlmann's formalistic method.

The second chapter of Part II, "Der Ekstatiker und die Sprache," is a rather disorganized attempt at analysis of Kuhlmann's language. It leads to no significant results. A casual discussion of Kuhlmann's *Spieltrieb* suggests a valuable comparison with Harsdörffer from this point of view. Particularly lacking is any attempt on Bock's part to see Kuhlmann within the framework of the German Baroque. Indeed, many features of the mystic's style, which are viewed by Bock as especially typical of Kuhlmann, are indeed typical of the Baroque as a whole. I speak, for example, of Bock's statement: "... der Dichter [wiederholt] seine eigene Formgebung und [verfällt] darüber ins Formelhafte . . ." (p. 98), or his ignoring of such essential features of Baroque style as the tendency to word-redundancy or the predilection for puns and word games with semi-serious interpretative intent. It is interesting to note that Bock claims of Kuhlmann's later poems: "Auffallend ist . . . die neu auftretende *Reimlosigkeit*. Sie ist nicht so sehr ein Zeichen grösserer dichterischer Freiheit als der abnehmenden Konzentration und Verdichtungskraft." Whereas, von Faber du Faur, whose poetic judgment has seldom been questioned, maintains: "... und schliesslich trägt ihn in den letzten Büchern des *Kühlpsalters* der Schwung der Ekstase in reimlose Rhythmen voller Weihe und Spannung."³

The work, as a whole, shows too many traces of the dissertation.

³ Curt von Faber du Faur, "Die Keimzelle des Kühlpsalters," *JEGPh*, XLVI (1947), p. 158.

It is vastly overfootnoted (527 footnotes to 100 pages of text), and, since the footnotes are given at the back of the book, it necessitates frequent thumbing back and forth, only to find the source for a Kuhlmann quotation or an exasperating "ebenda." This information could just as easily be given in parentheses in the text itself. Many of the footnotes are entirely unnecessary for a published work. In the final analysis, however, this book will be of great utility, both as a clear and reliable guide to the events of Kuhlmann's life and as a source of inspiration for future interpretations of Kuhlmann's mysticism.

University of California, Berkeley

BLAKE LEE SPAHR

Christel Matthias Schröder, *Die "Bremer Beiträge." Vorgeschichte und Geschichte einer deutschen Zeitschrift des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Bremen: Carl Schünemann Verlag, 1956. 312 pp.).

THIS monograph is the first to be written on one of the more renowned journals of eighteenth-century German literature. The intention of the author is to fill the gap by presenting the origin, the history, and the particular intellectual climate which produced the *Bremer Beiträge*; this, however, not so much from a literary point of view but rather "unter zeitschriftenkundlichen Gesichtspunkten."

Mr. Schröder begins his study with a critical survey of previous scholarly works and references to the *Bremer Beiträge* (e.g. those of Josef Körner, Wilhelm Kosch, Wolfdietrich Rasch *et al*). Here the author exposes for us the frequent omissions, discrepancies, and the usual copying from second hand material. Special praise, however, is attributed to Franz Muncker's edition of vols. 43 and 44 of Kürschner's collection *Deutsche National-Literatur* as well as to Muncker's introduction to these volumes, which Mr. Schröder considers the qualitatively most essential contribution to the appreciation of this journal and its contributors.

The second section of this study deals with the "*Vorgeschichte der Bremer Beiträge*." The development of the journal, which originally appeared under the title *Neue Beyträge zum Vergnügen des Verstandes und Witzes*, is given within the framework of a general survey characterising the development in the field of German journals beginning with Christian Thomasius' *Schertz- und ernsthafte, vernünfftige und einfältige Gedanken* . . . in 1668, the first journal in German,

through the *Moralische Wochenschriften* to Gottsched's various, often short-lived journalistic experiments from *Die Vernünftigen Tadlerinnen* (1725-26) to *Das Neueste aus der anmutigen Gelehrsamkeit* (1751-62). In 1741 Joachim Schwabe edited, more or less under the direction of Gottsched, the *Belustigungen des Verstandes und des Witzes*, whose contributors (Karl Christian Gärtner, Gottlieb Wilhelm Rabener, Gellert, Johann Elias Schlegel *et al*) he recruited from disciples and followers of Gottsched. The journal became the *Parteiorgan* of the Leipzig school. Schwabe, a most fanatic follower of Gottsched's doctrines, was, however, so arbitrary and totalitarian concerning both the selections and rejections of contributions that he aroused the rebellion of those contributors, notably Rabener and Gärtner, who later constituted the *Bremer Beiträge*. The *Belustigungen* discontinued its publications in June 1745. In the meantime, after having found the bookseller Saurmann for a publisher, Gärtner, the *spiritus rector* of the new undertaking had, with the help of Cramer and Adolf Schlegel, founded *Neue Beyträge zum Vergnügen des Verstandes und Witzes*, i. e. the *Bremer Beiträge*.

The intricate manipulations preceding the issue of the journal have clearly been documented by Mr. Schröder. Contemporary letters and papers, memoirs and the bulk of primary and secondary sources have been consulted, often meticulously and extensively quoted in an appendix, in order to render a faithful account of both the origin of the journal and the stature of its contributors. In regard to secondary sources, many new questions are raised by the author and some older statements are either corrected or supplemented (e. g. pp. 11, 53, 110, 193, 217, 233, 235, 237 ff., 253, 297, 298).

Having discussed at length the rather complicated circumstances that eventually brought about the existence of the journal, Mr. Schröder dedicates another chapter to Nathanael Saurmann, the publisher of the *Beiträge*. Saurmann, of whom we knew little so far, is depicted by Mr. Schröder actually as the true initiator of the journal, not because, as it is the case with most publishers, he was particularly interested in literary matters, "sondern weil er ein gutes Geschäft witterte" (p. 52). Mr. Schröder repudiates previous pejorative opinions about Saurmann's insignificance and within an extensive survey of the publishing and bookselling business in Bremen of the 18th century he substantiates the importance of Saurmann and his crucial, even though purely financial, interest in the publication of the journal.

The third, by far the longest section of the study gives a detailed account of the four volumes, of six "Stücke" each. He furthermore describes the impact the *Beiträge* made on other journals and papers and gives a report of Gottsched's satirical reaction in contrast to Bodmer's favorable one. The continuation of the *Neuen Beyträge* under the editorship of J. M. Dreyer concludes this section. Despite the literary poverty of most of the contributions to the *Beiträge*, except, of course, for Gellert's *Die Betschwester* and Klopstock's first three cantos of *Messias* (1748), the author nevertheless makes a laudable effort to put these relatively inferior pieces into a proper literary perspective. He accomplishes this through a complete examination of the entire contents of the four volumes; a labor which is the more rewarding to the reader because Mr. Schröder does not only establish authenticities of authorships but also offers a wealth of accurate information to any student of 18th century German literature.

"Die Bedeutung der *Bremer Beiträge*" is the title of the final section of the book in which Mr. Schröder surveys the differently shaded opinions of well-known literary historians such as Gervinus, Scherer, Hermann Schneider and Martini. Both by differing from and agreeing with their statements the author sums up his own opinion by stating that with the exception of Klopstock, the *Beiträger* were unable to create anything fundamentally new. The advance over Gottsched, however, is in Mr. Schröder's opinion greater than is generally assumed. In fact, the *Beiträger* can claim the merit of having gone beyond the age of Gottsched, not so much in critical theory as in their own productions, even though they be of limited value.

There is only one question I should like to raise. On p. 17 Mr. Schröder quotes in support of his own view a passage from Michael Bernay's biography on *Gottsched* (1880) in which Bernay claims that Gottsched's *Beiträge zur Critischen Historie der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit* (1732-44) "die literarische Kritik aus dem Schlepptau der Moral (befreien)." Is this so? Is it not rather the case that an infraction against morality could only be carried out to the point of the then so loved eclogues and idyls? True, in later years Gottsched changed this view somewhat (probably because of the pioneering influence of Johann Elias Schlegel) when he came to believe that morality asserts itself through itself. But did he actually ever cast it completely aside?—This, however, is almost an irrelevant question in view of such a thorough and scholarly study that nobody

interested in the literature and ideas of 18th century Germany can overlook.

New York University

EDGAR LOHNER

Gottfried F. Merkel, ed., *On Romanticism and the Art of Translation. Studies in Honor of Edwin Hermann Zeydel* (Princeton: Univ. Press, 1956. viii + 267 pp. \$4.50). THIS volume of eleven studies embraces a variety of subjects which are not well indicated even by this very general title. In fact some of the studies have next to nothing to do either with Romanticism in its widest definition or with the so-called 'art of translation.' Also as the range of subjects is diverse so is the quality of the essays, both in content and in style. Among the outstanding studies from both points of view are those of Gerhard, Atkins, Lange, Morgan and Schoolfield. The book has evidently been prepared with care and devotion by Gottfried Merkel. He has written a terse, appropriate preface and appreciation, and has provided a list of publications by Zeydel which is impressive.

The first essay, that of Atkins on irony and ambiguity in the final scene of *Faust* serves as an auspicious opening selection for this collection. It is also a logical, and lucid 'Rettung' of Goethe's *Faust* as a drama and shows a thorough familiarity with *Faust* scholarship. Atkins makes a number of well-taken, convincing new points. On the subject of 'das Göttliche im weiblichen Symbol,' e.g., he does well to go beyond Wiese, whose apodictic interpretations take no cognizance of the 'Erhabener Geist' scene.

Melitta Gerhard's *Goethe's "Geprägte Form" im Romantischen Spiegel zu Friedrich Schlegels Aufsatz über Goethes "Wilhelm Meister"* is a particularly well-written and perceptive piece in which the author analyzes Schlegel's unfinished essay about Goethe's novel and incidentally also uses it to illuminate some relationships between Classicism and Romanticism. Her discussion reflects to some degree the views of Fritz Strich.

Marianne Thalmann's examination of Tieck is thoughtful and scholarly but it is none the less diffuse and rambling and would seem to many to be extravagant in its admiration of Tieck. One would question the statement (p. 138) "Was Tieck noch besitzt, ist der Glaubensheld, der Dichter, der die Wirklichkeit Gottes unserem Erdboden eingeschrieben sieht. Er ist der letzte Held von Format, der

mit allen Waffen der Innerlichkeit ausgestattet ist, ehe der Kaufmann, Techniker und Sportler die alte Rolle ins rein Schauspielerische reißen." (What of Mörike et al.?) The title of the essay *Der Unwissend Gläubige* derives from Hamann with whom Tieck is paralleled as a critic. One might also challenge the statement (p. 105) "Was Ludwig Tieck vor allem kennzeichnet ist dieses Hören der Zeit." This is probably not the usual conception of Tieck and the author adduces little evidence from his literary works to support this assertion. And why does the writer make a point of mentioning at length (p. 116): "Dürer setzt Gestalten, 'die ganz wie wir selber sind,' etc." as though this had not been true of the art preceding Dürer by a century? Also the 'Vorwort' to the 'Lenzausgabe' was originally published in 1828, why does the writer (p. 107) find it necessary in a footnote to refer to the *Kritische Schriften* of 1852?

B. Q. Morgan's *On Translating Feminine Rimes*, one of the briefer studies is obviously of lesser scope but it is done with sensitivity and cogency and with a lucidity and a lightness of touch which, however, never leave in doubt the learning held in reserve. Morgan reiterates the fact that more so than any other literary genre, poetry presents for the translator well-nigh impossible problems. Since, in English, potential rimes are predominantly masculine, whereas in German there is a corresponding prevalence of feminine rimes, this brings up special questions of translation. The writer here examines three principal sources of feminine rimes available to a translator.

Gail's *Im Schatten der Griechen* is more accurately described by its subtitle (indicating influences around 1800) and even with that delimitation, it attempts to cover too vast an area for an essay. Otherwise this is an excellent piece of work with minor exceptions. One misses for example any mention of Herder's *Kritische Wälder*.

Lange's Mörike article is presented soundly and sensitively and is provided with a careful bibliography (the other studies in the book have none). Within the limits of this essay a fine evaluation of Mörike, the man and his work is skillfully sketched with admirable familiarity. Mörike emerges here also as an artist representative of his time. Occasionally the points made in this study are arrived at rather circumstantially and many critics might also disagree with the generalizations about Romanticism contained in such a statement as (p. 90) "Für die Romantiker ist das höchste Leben, das Geistige, unsinnlich, weshalb ihr nächtliches Träumen in der sinnträchtigen aber formzerstörenden Zeit vor sich geht."

Rosenberg's *Constant Factors in Translation* is thoroughly abstract with a veritable philosophy of translation—highly knowledgeable and erudite but with a large number of irrelevancies. One might well quarrel with the writer's choice of Herter-Norton as an excellent translator and particularly on the basis of Rilke's *Klage* where among other things this translator renders "das vorüberfuhr" as "that passed over."

Schoolfield's *Rilke and Narcissus* is well-documented, to the point, and in clear unpretentious language. Unfortunately the essay presupposes a knowledge of Swedish which not all scholars command. In discussing Rilke's translation of Fröding's *Narkissos*, the writer proposes "im Quelle" as being closer to the original than Rilke's translation "im Wasser." To a German ear the archaic "im Quelle" would probably have grated, because the feminine "Quelle" would have suggested itself. This would seem to be borne out by the fact that another translator, Badke actually chose a version using the feminine "Quelle." In most other judgments Schoolfield is very discerning.

Immerwahr in *German Romanticism and the Unity of the Romantic Imagination* devotes considerable space to the matter of the definition of Romanticism and definitions in general and then proceeds to the problem of 'Sturm und Drang' and Romanticism before he gets to his subject. The author would seem to be inconsistent in his use of the phrase 'Sturm und Drang' in so far as he translates some other phrases, titles and quotations into English (which incidentally seems surprising in a book of studies dealing with aspects of Germanistics). For Immerwahr the imaginative process is the key to the understanding of Romanticism of which he unquestionably evidences a wide knowledge.

Stylistically, the *Urjân* essay of Gleis leaves a great deal to be desired and is otherwise in sharp contrast to the other essays which set higher standards. Also Sinnema's treatment of the German source of the Middle Dutch "*Der Zotten Ende der Narren Scip*" seems overly long with much extraneous material.

The volume in the main is free from typographical errors. The reviewer noted only: in the Thalmann essay, p. 120 "*Karrikatur*," p. 131 "*einsan*" and in the Lange essay p. 91 *Wahrheir*.

The book as a whole, despite some infelicities, does credit to the profound and wide learning of the man it honors.

Princeton University

BERNHARD ULMER

act
and
ell
nt
ng
nat

nt,
re-
nd.
ter
e's
e"
uld
act
the
ery

an-
efi-
eds
he
in
ates
nci-
ects
the
ably

be
hich
urce
ems

The
ur,"
the

ER

Notes

t
l
t
g
t
r
l.
er
s
d
t
e
y
r
s
e
n
s
s
e
n
e
s
e
e
e
e

T

C

T

I

7

Recently Published Hopkins Books

The Sculptural Programs of Chartres Cathedral

Christ—Mary—Ecclesia

by Adolf Katzenellenbogen

This unusual study explains for the first time the total meaning of the various sculptural cycles of Chartres Cathedral. The author examines literary sources and liturgical texts as well as particular theological, philosophical and political concepts to find the vital forces behind the formation of the programs.

232 pages—79 illustrations \$10.00

The Ninth Volume of Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile—

Bede's Ecclesiastical History

Introduction by Peter Hunter Blair, Fellow and Tutor of Emmanuel College, Cambridge. The previous eight volumes in this outstanding series of reproductions may also be obtained from The Johns Hopkins Press.

258 pages in collotype \$80.00 paper \$91.00 leather

order from your bookstore or:

*The Johns Hopkins Press
Baltimore 18, Maryland*

A History of the Ode

Here is an inclusive yet selective history of an ancient poetic genre—the ode. Beginning with its inception in the classical genius of Pindar, Anacreon and Horace, the author traces the development of the ode, describes the types of odes—Classical, Humanist, Italian, French, English—and the ways in which poets utilized and modified the form.



THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE 18, MARYLAND

Modern Language Notes: regularly \$8.00 } **BOTH**
ELH: regularly \$6.00 } **for**
 \$10.00

Note: This offer limited to individual subscribers; not available to libraries and other institutions.



The Johns Hopkins Press

HOMewood • BALtimore 18 • MARYland